

In the second place, we have enormously expanded our national plant as expressed in terms of estimated national wealth. Our national wealth to-day may be considered as well in excess of the \$320,000,000,000 estimated by the Bureau of the Census for 1922, which compares with the figure of \$186,000,000,000 in 1912. This figure includes the value of land, structures and other improvements thereon, the equipment of industrial enterprises and farms, livestock, railroad and public utilities, pipe lines, shipping, irrigation enterprises, etc.

What I have described as plant expansion has been accompanied by a sharp increase in the volume of production, principally of manufactured goods. Thus, taking the physical volume of manufactured output in 1909 at 100, production increased to about 175 in 1927 and to 197 in 1929. In the latter part of this period the increased efficiency in production resulted in increased per capita output of those engaged in industry. Comparing 1919 and 1927 there was an increase of more than 40 per cent in the output per individual in manufacturing enterprises, and of 35 per cent in manufacturing, mining, agricultural, and railway transportation combined. Comparisons for individual industries are even more striking: The individual output per hour increased nearly 100 per cent in the automobile industry, about 163 per cent in the tire industry, and about 52 per cent in steel works and rolling mills, lines which have been conspicuously capable of adapting mechanical refinements and organization improvements in their processes.

Here, then, we have a rapid increase in the already large purchasing power of 120,000,000 people; an improved and expanded plant; greater efficiency in production and distribution, and as a result an ever-widening market for all manner of goods and services. Here is a real basis for prosperity. It is well to remember that these basic factors are still present and there is no reason why they should not contribute to our progress in the future as they have in the past. We are the possessors of a vast territory, rich in natural resources and populated with an energetic and intelligent people, constituting a tremendous economic unit, free from trade restrictions, and with a market in which mass production and a demand for commodities sustained by a means to satisfy it have gone hand in hand. Although the standards of equipment of the average man, whether for his labor, his comfort, his cultural development, or his recreation, are admittedly high, yet vast numbers in this country enjoy incompletely many even of the necessities of life. This is a fact which at the same time offers an opportunity and a challenge to the business man to-day.

Certainly one of the opportunities that confronts him is the opportunity by increased efficiency, lower costs, and studied adaptation of his products to market needs, so to diminish the price of his products as to render possible a wider distribution for them. This is not inconsistent with an expanding purchasing power in the domestic market, for increased productivity and increased effective demand experience has demonstrated can go hand in hand.

Given such a fundamentally favorable situation as exists in this country, it is irritating and puzzling to be confronted with periodic depressions. They seem somehow unnecessary. And yet to me the progress we have achieved in this country, the marvel of the present economic order, with the almost unlimited promise which it seems to hold out to the average man in the way of material betterment, are infinitely more impressive than any temporary recession. With the economic world in balance, increased production and increased purchasing power seem to supplement each other so naturally that we accept the two phenomena as a matter of course. But let any considerable group of people produce what isn't wanted or more than is wanted, let their goods fail to find a market, and their impaired purchasing power immediately affects the market for goods produced by other groups. A nicely adjusted balance is disturbed, the movement spreads, and almost before we know it we are confronted with the phenomenon known as a business depression and the most baffling of problems. It is only in times like these that we realize the intricacies of the system and how necessary it is to analyze and determine what are the controlling and determining forces.

When one considers what it means to have a freely competitive economic order, such as prevails throughout most of the world to-day, in which men engage freely in a wide variety of specialized activities for a money income, which is spent by them also quite freely upon a wide variety of commodities, and in response to frequently unstable preferences, and when one appreciates the importance of the psychological factor and the tendency of human beings to move all together in one direction or the other at the same time, it is easy to understand how complicated and susceptible is our whole economic structure. It explains why periodic depressions and readjustments seem almost to be inevitable. Whether they can be entirely eliminated is certainly questionable, but that they can be further mitigated is not too much to expect. After all, there was a time when we were satisfied with a banking and credit system subject only to corrective checks and balances that automatically became operative only when unsound developments had carried us to periods of costly and painful crises. With the organization of the Federal reserve system and the consequent centralization of responsibility for the supervision of credit developments, we made a great step forward. The Federal reserve act has not only given added strength to our credit structure but has provided us with a group of

officials whose duty it is to study changing business and credit conditions in order that business and commerce may benefit from an enlightened supervision of banking and credit developments. We have not yet reached perfection in the use of this instrument, but I believe that all will admit that its creation was a step in the right direction and that it has functioned, even in these early years of its existence, with untold benefit to the country.

The Federal reserve system did not come into existence until after many years of intensive study and work. The analogy is perhaps not quite legitimate, but if a proper solution of one of the great economic problems has been found and suitable machinery has been evolved for dealing with one of the important business factors, namely, that of credit, is it too much to hope that intensive study of all of the other complicated and intricate factors may yield similarly fruitful results? The President has recently proposed that "The whole range of our experience from this boom and slump should be placed under accurate examination with a view to determination of what can be done to achieve greater stability for the future, both in prevention and in remedy."

To me this is a most constructive suggestion. Certainly if there is any hope of maintaining balanced conditions in industry and trade as against haphazard adjustments on which we have in the main relied in the past, that hope lies in the gathering of accurate information, its careful analysis, the establishment of fundamental principles, and a wide understanding of those principles and facts on the part of individuals engaged in many lines of business activity. We have made such enormous strides in the gathering of current business statistics, information can be so readily, rapidly, and widely diffused, that it is not too much to hope that the business course of the future may be charted by the light of adequate information and knowledge and in accordance with recognized rules of conduct, resulting in greater safety to individual industries and in more assured stability in our economic life. What has been accomplished in the course of the last few months by collective efforts in a comparatively limited field, with very real effect in taking up the severity of the present down swing, is a pretty fair sample of the greater results that can be accomplished if the concerted efforts of the Nation can be intelligently directed to the maintenance of economic stability. We might as well understand, however, that no such goal is to be attained until there is not only intelligent direction but a very definite sense of responsibility on the part of all. Then, as now, there will be no escape from the consequences of ill-advised actions.

Let me conclude as I began: I am not here to tell you whether business is going to be good, bad, or indifferent in the next three or four months. But it is not inappropriate at this time to remind you how far we in the United States have traveled along the economic highway in the last few years; that certain definite factors contributed to our progress; that they are still available; and that while the road may temporarily run through a valley, it still stretches out before us holding infinite promise.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McNARY. I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate (at 4 o'clock and 38 minutes p. m.) adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, May 22, 1930, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 21, 1930

COAST GUARD

Peery L. Stinson to be a temporary ensign in the Coast Guard of the United States, to take effect from date of oath.

APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY

To be Chief of Ordnance, with the rank of major general, for a period of four years from date of acceptance, with rank from April 2, 1930

Brig. Gen. Samuel Hof, assistant to the Chief of Ordnance, vice Maj. Gen. Clarence C. Williams, Chief of Ordnance, retired from active service April 1, 1930.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, May 21, 1930

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, whatever the falsities or errors that may cloud and confuse our vision, never permit us to lose faith in our immortal hopes and in the eternal verities. We thank Thee for the truths which transcend the trivial and the mortal and assume an endless life and a glorious destiny. Bless and direct the hidden sympathies and emotions of our souls, which silently, though masterfully, sway the course of our lives. Continue to

enlarge the rims of our mental and spiritual horizons that we may not dwindle and wither. We pray that immortal love may be the fixed axis of our beings and obedience to law the rule of our conduct until we enter upon the vast journey of undisturbed blessedness. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 185. An act to amend section 180, title 28, United States Code, as amended;

H. R. 9444. An act to authorize the erection of a marker upon the site of New Echota, capital of the Cherokee Indians prior to their removal west of the Mississippi River, to commemorate its location, and events connected with its history; and

H. R. 11196. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the White River at or near Clarendon, Ark.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 11965. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House to bills of the following titles:

S. 195. An act to facilitate the administration of the national parks by the United States Department of the Interior, and for other purposes;

S. 320. An act authorizing reconstruction and improvement of a public road in Wind River Indian Reservation, Wyo.;

S. 1171. An act to establish and operate a national institute of health, to create a system of fellowships in said institute, and to authorize the Government to accept donations for use in ascertaining the cause, prevention, and cure of disease affecting human beings, and for other purposes;

S. 3746. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Maysville, Ky.; and

S. 3934. An act granting certain lands to the city of Sault Ste. Marie, State of Michigan.

ADDITIONAL UNITED STATES PRISONS

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6807) establishing two institutions for the confinement of United States prisoners, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 6807, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments. The Clerk will report the bill and the Senate amendments.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

The Clerk reported the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 4, line 9, strike out all after "That," down to and including "produce" in line 17, and insert "any industry established under authority of this act be so operated as not to curtail the production within its present limits, of any existing arsenal, navy yard, or other Government workshop."

Page 4, line 23, strike out all after "Government" down to and including "hereof" in line 3, page 5, and insert "and the several Federal departments and all other Government institutions of the United States shall purchase at not to exceed current market prices such products of the industries herein authorized to be carried on as meet their requirements and as may be available and are authorized by the appropriations from which such purchases are made. Any disputes as to the price, quality, suitability, or character of the products manufactured in any prison industry and offered to any Government department shall be arbitrated by a board consisting of the Comptroller General of the United States, the Superintendent of Supplies of the General Supply Committee, and the Chief of the United States Bureau of Efficiency, or their representatives. The decision of said board shall be final and binding upon all parties."

Page 5, line 7, after "of," where it appears the first time, insert "industrial."

Page 5, line 9, after "employees," insert "engaged in any industrial enterprise."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has the gentleman from Pennsylvania consulted with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS]?

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have the authority, given unanimously, of the entire Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

FEDERAL PROBATION OFFICERS

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3975) to amend sections 726 and 727 of title 18, United States Code, with reference to Federal probation officers, and to add a new section thereto, with a Senate amendment, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 3975, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment. The Clerk will report the bill and the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 3, line 23, strike out all after "shall" down to and including "shall," in line 25.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

EMPLOYMENT OF FEDERAL PRISONERS

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7412) to provide for the diversification of employment of Federal prisoners, for their training and schooling in trades and occupations, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 7412, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments. The Clerk will report the bill and the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 2, line 2, after "roads," insert "the cost of which is borne exclusively by the United States."

Page 2, line 5, after "in," insert "major."

Page 2, line 24, strike out all after "That," down to and including "produce," in line 7, page 3, and insert "any industry established under authority of this act be so operated as not to curtail the production within its present limits, of any existing arsenal, navy yard, or other Government workshop."

Page 4, line 3, after "institutions," insert "heretofore or hereafter established."

Page 4, line 20, after "of," insert "industrial."

Page 4, line 25, after "employees," insert "engaged in any industrial enterprise."

Page 5, line 2, after "of," insert "industrial."

Page 5, line 11, strike out all after "prices," down to and including "representative," in line 12.

Page 5, after line 15, insert "Any disputes as to the price, quality, suitability or character of the products manufactured in any prison industry and offered to any Government department shall be arbitrated by a board consisting of the Comptroller General of the United States, the Superintendent of Supplies of the General Supply Committee, and the Chief of the United States Bureau of Efficiency, or their representatives. The decision of said board shall be final and binding upon all parties."

Page 6, line 5, after "camp," insert "for the first year or any part thereof, and for any succeeding year or any part thereof not to exceed five days for each month of actual employment in said industry or said camp."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE—PERMISSION TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF HOUSE

Mr. HALL of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, I ask unanimous consent that that committee be permitted to sit during the sessions of the House on next Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, the 26th, 27th, and 28th of May.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be permitted to sit during the sessions of the House during next Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE PRISON OF THE FUTURE

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech on prisons, made by Mr. Sanford Bates, superintendent of prisons, Department of Justice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered by the Hon. Sanford Bates, superintendent of prisons, Department of Justice, before the conference of mental hygiene at Washington, D. C., May 9, 1930.

The address is as follows:

It is a significant and gratifying event for a prison man to be invited to address an international conference on mental hygiene. It is a hopeful omen when a great and learned body of men and women who are devoting their lives to the scientific study of human nature set aside an evening to discuss some of the perplexing problems which assail our governmental agencies when we attempt to control or correct the human failures of our communities. I feel at once grateful for the opportunity to address you and also humble in the presence of so many people who have given so much and such productive thought to this great question.

May I not at the outset, on behalf of our struggling, groping American prison system, acknowledge the great debt which we owe to the penologists of the countries of Europe whose distinguished representatives have honored this conference by their presence. The strictly impartial and speedy system of criminal justice in England and the professionalization of its prison personnel; the successful system for the care and correction of juveniles in Holland; the splendid psychiatric studies in the prisons of Belgium; the modern and scientific development of adult prisons in Germany; the brilliant and convincing contributions made by the Italian school of criminologists; the remarkable success in Switzerland in the treatment of misdemeanor types of offenders on prison farms, to mention only a few of Europe's outstanding contributions, all excite our envy and command our admiration.

It might be well to refer at the outset to the duality of our American penal systems. In each of our 48 sovereign States we have a separate and independent prison organization. Under the Constitution, the States delegated certain duties and rights to the central or Federal Government. The enforcement of laws enacted under this Constitution, laws presumably National or Federal, rather than local in character, is the business of the National Government. All other offenses are punished by the States.

I wish I could report to you to-night that America has solved the problem of the prison. But I can not. The topic of this paper must, therefore, be the Prison of the Future. Indeed, I doubt if the prison problem can be isolated and treated as a single problem. When we have solved the problems of poverty, bad heredity, industrial inequality, physical and mental inadequacy, we shall probably likewise have solved the problem of the prison.

There is not much to be said for the prison of the past. Oscar Wilde said about all of it when he wrote:

"I know not whether laws be right
Or whether laws be wrong,
All that we know who be in gaol
Is that the wall is strong;
And that each day is like a year,
A year whose days are long.
But this I know, that every law
That men have made for man
Since first man took his brother's life,
And the sad world began,
But straws the wheat and saves the chaff
With a most evil fan."

The prison of the present has evolved from a place purely of detention into a place of punishment. We have progressed far enough along the path of civilization to have largely discarded capital punishment, expatriation, and corporal punishment as penal correctives and for want of some better or more appropriate solution have been to some extent forced to adopt the expedient of sequestering our criminals in places of more or less permanent confinement. We have hit upon the idea of adapting jails or prisons originally used to detain prisoners pending their trial, or awaiting other forms of punishment, into places of punishment in themselves. There was reason for this. Patrick Henry knew whereof he spoke when said, "Give me liberty or give me death." A prison, for a human being as well as for a bird or an animal, no matter how the cage may be gilded, is for many a living death—the nadir in punishment.

It will therefore be noted that we have not always chosen candidates for imprisonment on the basis of their present danger to the community and have used our prisons not only to control persons against antisocial acts in the future but to make them miserable because of antisocial acts in the past. It is this idea, by the way, which leads many sincere, practical people to question the wisdom and efficacy of the so-called scien-

tific prison methods which are being proposed, and, in a sense, their doubts are justified, for the reason that if the prison is only designed to take the place of the stake or the cat-o-nine-tails or the dungeon chamber, then it stands to reason that it will not be an effective prison unless it does make its inmates reasonably unhappy and miserable.

In America to-day it would be difficult to provoke any real dissent to the proposition that the prisons have not succeeded in their purpose. A series of prison riots in which lives of both officers and inmates have been sacrificed, culminating in the Columbus horror of a few weeks ago, have resulted in the almost unanimous conclusion among our editorial writers, that prisons have failed. Have failed in what? Failed to make their inmates miserable? The desperate efforts of the inmates to liberate themselves do not seem to make that ground tenable. We need hardly be afraid that our prisons are coddling their prisoners or making their stay too attractive. Failed to keep men in the prisons once they have been committed there? This can hardly be maintained, as the number of men who have successfully made their escapes in this whole series of riots can be counted on the fingers of one hand. It may have taken steel and iron and machine-gun companies to hold them in, but they have not escaped. Have they failed to make the majority of the rejects and outcasts and unfortunates of society which finally reach their portals over into tractable and law-abiding citizens? They certainly have, and the conviction is beginning to dawn on us that they will continue to do so until organized and operated on an entirely different basis and with a different object in view, and until our attitude is one of helpful interest instead of disdainful neglect.

Let us be fair to the prisons. They are not entirely to blame for the disturbances of the past year. We have delegated to the poorest equipped agency a task which the combined ingenuity of all the rest of society has yet found impossible of solution—the task of controlling criminal conduct. When 3,000,000 men were returned from the rigors and brutalities of the war, when wages were reduced, many thoughtful students of sociology predicted an increase in crime similar to that which has followed every great war. In the meantime several new and dangerous elements had entered our civilization. The use of the automobile had almost become twentyfold, small side arms and even machine guns had almost become accepted articles of personal equipment. The youth of our country entered upon a period of determined self-emancipation. The old orthodox religious controls were being challenged and disregarded. There has ensued a period of desperate, dangerous, selfish criminality.

It has been commonly maintained that the crime rate in this country has been mounting rapidly. Such figures as we have would seem to indicate this. It must be pointed out, however, that it is not safe to assume that the country is therefore more criminal or more vicious than formerly. It may be that we have more crime because we have more of everything else. Again our country has not the homogeneous population, the settled traditions, and the well-oiled judicial systems that many foreign countries are blessed with. Again our growing prison population at least may be in part accounted for somewhat by the fact that we have recently lengthened the terms of our sentences and withdrawn the privileges of parole. It may also be that we have more criminals because we have recently tried to raise the standards of conduct by making acts criminal which were not so formerly.

This is especially true with reference to Federal offenses.

It is still contended, on the other hand, that the crime wave, so-called, was not unusual; that it was participated in by but a small section of our communities, that the total volume of crime is not greater to-day than formerly; but it is more spectacular, and to the extent that it utilized more dangerous instrumentalities it is certainly more menacing.

Now, there were two ideas of ways to handle the situation. Society could attempt to understand, to labor, to treat with the criminal, to train him into better ways. During the period 1900–1920 much of this work was undertaken. This was the period of the birth of the juvenile court and the development of probation, parole, and the indeterminate sentence. Society could continue this attempt or it could arm and fight. We did the most natural and what seemed to us the most protective and immediate thing to do—we fought. Crime commissions investigated and came to the conclusion that we had gone too far in sympathizing with the criminal; that we owed it to ourselves and to the victims of the crime to treat law violators in a more condign and summary fashion. So we tightened on parole, we lengthened sentences, we attacked probation, and for the time being we waved the social sciences aside. Now, it is impossible to confine a fight to one side. Minor disturbances occurred in prisons. Crime, having itself assumed a war-like appearance, increased in intensity. The culmination came with the terrible prison riots of the past year.

It is idle to discuss or determine who started the war. The fight is on, and the position which we take with reference to the treatment of prisoners within the next few years will be of extreme importance to our future welfare. Let the fight go on, but let it be along the lines suggested by President Hoover and his excellent crime commission—against delay, against corruption, against indifference, against greed and selfishness, against ignorance, against the evils themselves which have brought us to the conditions in which we find ourselves.

The thoughtful observer to-day who candidly questions the efficiency of the punitive treatment still hesitates to expose his community to the risk of abandoning the protection which comes from imprisoning its law violators. He insists that the program of swift and sure punishment as a social corrective must not be weakened. How can we devise a system which will be at once a present protection and still comprehend a program of sound humanitarian rehabilitation?

The first duty of society is to protect its members. All scientific theories must be tested on the basis of whether they accomplish or defeat this end. Let us assume that until we devise something better the prisons and reformatories are to continue to represent our answer to the demand of society that its law breakers shall be punished. The vast majority of men and women who go to prison will shortly emerge. The community will not be safe if they come out worse than when they went in. With some men the prison experience will be in itself a regenerating influence. They will be either more honest or more careful in the future. Possibly the mere disgrace of exposure, or loss of social prestige, or conviction would have done as much for this type.

Recent studies have demonstrated, however, that in a majority of instances a prison term is not an improving experience. This, it should again be pointed out, is not entirely the prison's fault. It seems obvious, therefore, that if the prison is to direct its efforts toward the permanent protection of society it must do more than make men temporarily miserable, more antisocial, and eventually more dangerous. The function of the prison as originally conceived is a simple one. The function of the prison as a place of reformation or regeneration is one of extreme difficulty.

Assuming, then, that the prison of the present has failed, or as stated more accurately, assuming that the task of the prison has not been performed to the extent expected and demanded by our communities, that the lesson it was supposed to teach has not been effective to produce the desired results, what should be the prison of the future?

Our distinguished Attorney General, William D. Mitchell, whose stand on the prison problem has been a fearless and humane one, has recently said, "The prison of the future should be at once a disciplinary school for those who can be reformed, a place of permanent segregation for the incorrigible, and a laboratory for the study of the causes of crime."

May I take this opportunity to present four directions in which the prison of the future will differ from the prison of the past. In some of our States much progress has been made toward a realization of these ideals, and where such progress has been made it can be successfully demonstrated that the crime situation has improved. For years penologists and sociologists have had a vision of what a prison might be. The reports of annual meetings of the American Prison Association for 50 years back will testify to the sincere efforts of many devoted men and women to better prison conditions. These conditions are infinitely better than they were half a century ago, but it has taken the bloody riots of recent history to bring about any general public movement toward the realization of these ideals.

In the first place, the prison buildings and equipment of the next generation will be so constructed and devised as to lend themselves to the application of constructive programs of rehabilitation. Stone caves and barred doors may be necessary for a certain percentage of our criminal population, but they are not designed to bring out the higher and nobler sentiments in human nature. We have been in the habit of putting all of our prison population in an environment suited for the needs of a small percentage. The most encouraging progress American States have made in the treatment of the offender has been along extramural lines—probation, parole, the juvenile court, the foster home, and placing-out systems are splendid examples of American ingenuity and progressiveness in penal matters.

Strangely enough these expedients have, though they diminish the so-called sanctions of the law, succeeded where prisons have not. States employing these methods most largely are freest from crime waves. Massachusetts, for example, has long been referred to as the State which makes the fullest use of probation. Page 4 of a recent pamphlet published by the Census Bureau shows the general increase in number of persons in State prisons and reformatories per 100,000 to have risen from 68.5 in 1904 to 79.3 in 1927, whereas in the same period the number of inmates per 100,000 in the State of Massachusetts has dropped from 64.5 to 45.6.

The prisons, especially those of the Federal Government, are now dangerously overcrowded. The obvious, the orthodox thing to do, seems to build more prisons. The Federal Prison Bureau is insisting, however, that with new prisons shall go increased probation, better supervised parole, and such substitutes for and improvements on prisons as can be devised. So we have our Federal women's reformatory at Alderson, an institution founded on the principle that every woman offender is entitled at least once to be brought in touch with a fine, clean environment and subject to improving influences. We have our Federal reformatory for boys at Chillicothe, and our newly established Federal prison camp systems. Six hundred men have now been transferred to road and construction camps on Army reservations at Fort Bragg, N. C.; Fort Riley, Kans.; and Fort Meade, Md. A temporary construction project has been authorized at Camp Lee, Va., where forestation and agricultural camp will be established. Similar projects have been contemplated

in the national forests and parks, so that at the end of next year 1,700 men, who otherwise would be housed in Federal penitentiaries, will be doing an honest day's work for the Government on projects which would not otherwise be done. In the extension of its institutional facilities, jail as well as prison, the Federal Government plans to utilize existing Government property and resources wherever that is possible.

For some time to come, however, prisons of one kind or another will be necessary. The prison of the future will be of strong construction where strength is needed, but it will give prominent place to the hospital, the laboratory, the school, the mental hygienic clinic, and the workshop. It will have a farm and a library—albeit it may be found necessary to eliminate those modern refinements of cruel and unusual punishment—the motion picture and the radio. It will not be an asylum or a place of amusement or a dungeon. It will be clean, and teach cleanliness. It will be busy, and teach industry. It will be stern, and teach discipline. The new institutions for Federal institutions have been planned by Congress on those lines.

In the second place, the prison of the future will be manned by persons who will be trained in the science of understanding human nature. Too long have we left the conduct of our prisons in the hands of men picked at random on the basis of size, strength, and inability to get a position anywhere else. Under existing conditions it is astonishing to find the large number of sincere prison wardens conscientiously devoted to their jobs and the great proportion of prison guards who perform the disagreeable and the dangerous task with fidelity and loyalty, but who have been chosen without emphasis on the fundamental aspects of their duties.

The prison service to-day can be professionalized. The United States Government is making a start in that direction. A school for prison officers has been established. The other day a class of 30 men graduated from a four months' intensive course, including the science and theory of criminology, lectures on elementary medicine, psychiatry, and first aid, together with the more practical subjects of jujutsu, floor drill, and self-protection.

Recently a notice was sent to the universities of America calling attention to the fact that the prison service offered a productive field for college graduates. In the last two weeks the Federal Prison Bureau has received over 200 applications from college men. Once this idea has taken hold—that the prison offers an opportunity for intelligent and constructive work—improvement in our personnel may be expected. This may well be followed by a system of promotional examinations and the extension of the protection of the civil service in the whole of our penal system.

In the third place, much attention will be given to the realization of the important fact that an idle mind is the devil's workshop. No serious prison riot has yet taken place in an institution where all the inmates have been provided with steady and productive labor. It is to the everlasting credit of our American Federation of Labor and the employing interests of the country as well that they have come to the realization of the important truth that idleness in prison is a public menace. The adoption of the State-use theory of prison labor is a compromise upon which all can agree. The Government has a right to employ its own wards in the manufacture of articles for its own consumption. Private interest in prison labor is to be abolished. The prisoner must not be exploited. He can be taught valuable lessons in self-reliance, thrift, and industriousness through a carefully guarded wage or token system. The Government must not go into competition in the industrial field. But, on the other hand, it must be given access to its own industrial market. The one feature upon which editorial comments are unanimous is on this phase of the problem. We do not always look to the Saturday Evening Post for guidance on scientific or sociological subjects. It may even be said to have a hard-boiled clientele. The following extract from a recent editorial, however, is a straightforward, fearless, and progressive challenge:

"Most important, perhaps, of all, the prisoners must not be idle, and if there is not enough ingenuity to solve this particular problem, then we might as well give up in despair any attempt to handle the crime situation. Of all crimes against society none quite equals that of keeping prison inmates idle and unoccupied. Surely the evils which flow therefrom must far exceed any small harm which comes from the sale of prison-made goods in the commercial markets."

The bill in Congress which the Senate passed yesterday calls for a diversified prison-industry system in Federal prisons, the payment of a modest wage to the inmate, and access to governmental markets, including road building, public works, reforestation, etc. Its passage marks an epoch in American prison history.

Fourth, we finally come to the most difficult and yet the most hopeful function of the prison of the future. We must find some way to individualize the corrective and protective treatment to be given the inmates. Men may be punished en masse; it is doubtful if they can be reformed that way. What will help one man will not cure another. It is just at this point that the psychiatrist and the mental hygienist can be of inestimable value in the development of our future prison program. Before we can treat we must prescribe. The astonishing accumula-

tion of knowledge made in the last quarter of a century in the science of psychiatry will be heavily drawn upon. The guard force in the prison, trained as above outlined, will be augmented and perhaps supplemented by physicians and psychometrists, vocational instructors, research assistants, librarians, athletic instructors, superintendents of schools, morale officers, parole supervisors, who will find their places as component parts in the program of individualization. The difficult thing, of course, in the tremendously large population of the State and Federal penitentiaries is to isolate and disagnose the individual and his problem.

In many prisons the need for such program has been felt and in the Federal institutions it is taking definite shape. Based on legislation which has just been approved, the well-organized Public Health Service, under the sound and expert guidance of Surgeon General Cumming, has been called in to organize and supplement the medical and psychiatric service in Federal prisons. Educational directors have been appointed in each institution, in most of them a trained librarian, in some of them morale officers and vocational superintendents. The chart herewith submitted will give some picture of the possibilities of such a program. It may readily be seen that a large part of the success of such plan depends upon accurate diagnosis, which we expect from that branch of the medical profession which produces the modern psychiatrist. The insane, feeble-minded, and psychiatric must be recognized and cared for elsewhere.

I know that most of you have read with keen delight Mr. Walter Lippman's Preface to *Morals*, but I can not refrain at this point from reading an extract from it:

"Great progress has been made in scientific psychology within the last generation, enough progress, I think, to supplement in important ways our own unanalyzed and intuitive wisdom about life. But it would be idle to suppose that the science of psychology is in a stage where it can be used as a substitute for experienced and penetrating imaginative insight. A good meteorologist can be confident of the weather. But we can not have that kind of confidence in even the best of psychologists.

"Indeed, an acquaintance with psychologists will, I think, compel anyone to admit that if they are good psychologists they are almost certain to possess a gift of insight which is unaccounted for by their technical apparatus. Doubtless it is true that in all the sciences the difference between a good scientist and a poor one comes down at last, after all the technical and theoretical procedure has been learned, to some sort of residual flair for the realities of that subject.

"But in the study of human nature that residual flair, which seems to be composed of intuitions, common sense, and unconsciously deposited experience, plays a much greater rôle than it does in the more advanced sciences.

"The uses of psychology to the moralist are, therefore, in confirming and correcting, in broadening and organizing, his insight into human nature" (pp. 172-173).

"Therefore you 'psychologists' can help us 'moralists' to broaden our 'experienced and penetrating imaginative insight.'"

The psychiatrist or mental hygienist, whether he calls himself by that name or not, is in the prison business to stay.

All we ask of him is that he work with us and not apart from us, that he realize the tremendous difficulties of our work, that he not content himself with telling us what is (or was) wrong with our offenders, but that he take his coat off and go into the operating room with us to help correct and cure them. Oh, yes; and one more thing he might do: When he has discovered the causes, the community, environmental, or hereditary causes, he might go out into the great society which is the recruiting ground of our human material and tell its members how to keep away from us. We penologists are the only people for whom poor business means success. When our customers stop doing business with us and attend the clinic, the hospital, the vocational school, the social center, and the churches instead, it will be the happiest act of some future warden to tack up on his front gate the sign "Closed—going out of business."

Hopeful developments then lie ahead of us. Those of us who have been recently working with the Federal prison system are greatly encouraged at the readiness of the President, the administrative departments, and both Houses of Congress to cooperate in a forward-looking solution of the national prison problem. The legislative program which has passed the House and received the approval of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate calls for an extension of the Federal probation system; a new board of parole with a scientific parole supervision; a diversified prison-labor program along Government-use lines; the establishment of a penitentiary in the Northeast and a reformatory in the Southwest; a general hospital for defective delinquents and criminal insane in the central part of the country; a reorganization of the Federal Prison Bureau with power to classify and transfer prisoners, to set new standards for county jails, and exercise closer control over Federal institutions; and a bill to utilize the services of the Public Health Service in building up an adequate medical unit in each of our Federal institutions. Also substantial increases in appropriations have been given or promised.

Our great problem, then, is to harmonize the police and custodial function of the prison with the educational and correctional function. It may be necessary to make this amalgamation tactfully and gradually, but in the long run there can be no substitute for intelligence. Scientific intelligence has revolutionized our mechanical civilization in the last century. If it can be applied with success in the fields of commerce, medicine, and sociology it can be applied in connection with the more difficult and baffling problems of human nature.

As we ponder to-day whether we are likely to give too much attention to the individual prisoner, if we are still assailed by doubts as to the wisdom of spending our substance and our intelligence upon this difficult problem, I commend the reading of a remarkable document written by Judge Josiah Quincy, judge of the town of Boston, Mass., in 1822, handed to me by my friend Herbert Parsons, godfather of probation, in which he says:

"The more vicious, the more base, the more abandoned the class of society on which any department of justice acts, the more and the weightier is the reason that those who administer it should be elevated above all interest and all fear and all suspicion and all reproach. Everywhere the robe of justice should be spotless; but in that part where it is destined to touch the ground, where from its use it must mix with the soil, there its texture should contain and preserve whatever there is of celestial quality in human life and conduct; there, if possible, its ermine should dazzle by exceeding whiteness and be steeped not only with the deep fountains of human learning but be purified in those heavenly dews which descend alone from the source of divine and eternal justice."

Finally, we must be ready to assure ourselves and convince the public that in the adoption of this future program of prison management there will be no diminution in the insistence on strict law obedience and enforcement. A complex civilized community must have rules for conduct and rewards and penalties for their observance or defiance. Whatever we do in controlling conduct, let us do it quickly and accurately, impartially and justly. It is surely better to do a little promptly than a lot some time in the future.

But when we punish, or treat, or prevent, let it be scientific and intelligent and protective. It must also be made clear that science is not synonymous with leniency of treatment. The psychiatrist with his insistence on accurate diagnosis and prompt segregation of incorrigibles, not to make them suffer but to protect the law abiding, is much less lenient than his critics may be in their unreasonable prejudices and preconceptions. We must be prepared to demonstrate that corrective and reformatory treatment is in the long run protective. We must keep close watch upon its results to see that it is. One of the most searching questions that can be faced may be stated in these terms: Which is the most important to society as a whole, to attempt to reform on humane terms the 90,000 men and women now in our State and Federal penitentiaries and reformatories, or through fear of punishment attempt to deter the 120,000,000 still on the outside? It is my firm conviction that we can do both. Punishment may be so devised as to be at once protective, corrective, and deterrent. It is punishment to the tramp or hobo to give him a bath. It is punishment to the shiftless boy to send him regularly to school. It is punishment to the loafer or parasite to make him earn his bread by the sweat of his brow. It is punishment to the nonsupporter to make him support, instead of sending him to jail where he can not support, and it may not be too idealistic to say, as it has so often been said, that it is a keener humiliation and disappointment to a thug who expects to be treated like a rough neck to treat him with the decency and consideration which perhaps he may not deserve.

There are many who will say these are fine-sounding ideals, they square with scientific discovery and research, they breathe the sentiments of the Christian religion, but they just don't work when applied to the members of the gang lands of Chicago and New York. This may be true. There is no nostrum or serum which always works. Furthermore, science teaches that there is sometimes a tolerance in a body, whether human or politic, against which no medicine can prevail.

In such case the doctor or psychiatrist is apt to say, "Oh, that we could have had this case earlier, this condition might have been prevented." And so, it may likewise be said as to the most vicious and abandoned member of a criminal gang.

And so we may leave this problem of the future with the frank admission that even under the most favorable circumstances, with the finest prison structure manned by intelligent and devoted officers, with its inmates working steadily at productive labor and a staff of experts laboring with the individual problems, it will not be entirely successful. Bad heredity, faulty environment, lack of opportunity, warped personality of its inmates will have made impressions too deep to be eradicated. But in the effort to do so, much material will be unearthed, many studies on personalities and causes of crime will be undertaken and completed which will be of inestimable value to society in the coming generations.

The prevention of crime in the future is more hopeful than its cure in the present and this is the task not only of the prison but of the whole community. When one wants a statement of dramatic and convincing power with reference to any of our social ills, he can often find

it in the pages of that great English penologist, Charles Dickens, who has said:

"Who turns his back upon the fallen and disfigured of his kind, abandons them as vile, and does not trace and track with pitying eyes the unfenced precipice by which they fell from good does wrong to Heaven and man, to time, and to eternity."

CORRECTION

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday an amendment which I prepared for House Joint Resolution 300, to permit the Pennsylvania Gift Fountain Association to erect a fountain in the District of Columbia, is erroneous as finally presented and agreed to and does not accomplish its purpose. I desired to say "and its adequacy for the site designated." Instead of that the amendment I wrote reads "the adequacy of the site designated," which is quite different. I ask unanimous consent to vacate the proceedings by which House Joint Resolution 300 passed and by which the amendment referred to was adopted, so that I may offer the proper amendment and have the resolution finally passed with that amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to vacate the proceedings by which the amendment to House Joint Resolution 300 was passed and by which the House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, read a third time, and passed. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. After the gentleman left the Chamber yesterday upon the adoption of the amendment referred to, it occurred to me that the word "propriety" would better express the intent involved than the word "adequacy" as incorporated in the amendment.

Mr. CRAMTON. Then I suggest that we use both words.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. CRAMTON: Page 2, line 2, before the word "shall," insert the words "and its adequacy and propriety for the site designated."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to; and the joint resolution as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed was laid on the table.

CLASSIFICATION OF CLERKS IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE

The SPEAKER. This is Calendar Wednesday. The Clerk will call the list of committees.

The Clerk called the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I call up the bill H. R. 9110.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania calls up the bill H. R. 9110, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9110) for the grading and classification of clerks in the Foreign Service of the United States of America, and providing compensation therefor.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar. The House therefore resolves itself automatically into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] will please take the chair.

Thereupon the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 9110, with Mr. MICHENER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 9110, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9110) for the grading and classification of clerks in the Foreign Service of the United States of America, and providing compensation therefor.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. DYER. May I inquire of the gentleman from Pennsylvania if this is a long bill?

Mr. TEMPLE. No.

Mr. DYER. Then I ask that the bill be reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the clerks in the Foreign Service of the United States of America shall be graded and classified as follows, and shall receive, within the limitation of such appropriations as the Congress may make, the basic compensations specified:

Senior clerks: Class 1, \$4,000; class 2, \$3,750; class 3, \$3,500; class 4, \$3,250; class 5, \$3,000.

Junior clerks: Class 1, \$2,750; class 2, \$2,500; class 3, all clerks whose compensation as fixed by the Secretary of State is less than \$2,500 per annum.

SEC. 2. Appointments to the grade of senior clerks and advancement from class to class in that grade shall hereafter be by promotion for efficient service, and no one shall be promoted to the grade of senior clerk who is not an American citizen and has not served as a clerk in a diplomatic mission or a consulate, or both, or as a clerk in the Department of State for at least five years.

SEC. 3. That the Secretary of State is hereby authorized, at posts where in his judgment it is required by the public interests for the purpose of meeting the unusual or excessive costs of living ascertained by him to exist, to grant compensation to clerks assigned there in addition to the basic rates herein specified, within such appropriation as Congress may make for such purpose: *Provided, however,* That all such additional compensation with the reasons therefor shall be reported to Congress with the annual Budget.

SEC. 4. No clerk who is not an American citizen shall hereafter be appointed to serve in a diplomatic mission.

SEC. 5. The President is hereby authorized to prescribe regulations for the administration of the foregoing provisions.

SEC. 6. Section 5 of the act of April 5, 1906, entitled "An act to provide for the reorganization of the Consular Service" (U. S. C., p. 646, sec. 57), is hereby repealed.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, this bill has been recommended by the State Department and considered by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It is a bill for the improvement of the Foreign Service of the United States.

We have as clerks 2,113 persons in the foreign field. The average compensation is \$1,288 a year. Seven hundred and fifty seven of these are American citizens, and their average compensation is \$2,090. The remaining 1,356 clerks are foreigners who receive an average compensation of only \$841. A consideration of the facts and of the work to be done itself attracts attention at once to what appears to be inadequate compensation.

I think the bill is very meritorious, and I hope it will pass.

I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, this bill has for its purpose the grading and classification of clerks in the Foreign Service of the United States and the providing of compensation therefor. It is a companion bill to the Rogers Act, which was passed May 24, 1924—six years ago. In that act, Congress took care of the career or professional group in the Foreign Service, and in this bill we are taking care of the noncareer or nonprofessional group.

The main object of this bill is to put the Foreign Service clerks on a classified basis, so that men entering this service may know what their future shall be if they continue in it and make the grade.

There are 2,113 of these clerks. The average compensation is \$1,288. Seven hundred and fifty-seven of them are American citizens, and the remaining 1,356 are foreigners. The foreigners receive an average salary, as stated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TEMPLE], of \$841 per annum. The foreign clerks constitute typists, stenographers, interpreters, and all noncareer men.

Now, a comparison of salaries paid by other departments of the Government is as follows: The Treasury Department pays an average of \$1,500 a year. The Department of Agriculture and the Department of Commerce have no limit, whereas by a law enacted in 1906, 24 years ago, the State Department was limited to a salary of \$1,000 for foreign clerks.

I do not think I could better express the importance of this bill than by reading a short excerpt from the statement of the Secretary of State. He said:

While the war retarded the development of many other nations, it spurred the United States to a development in industry, finance, and commerce unprecedented. The Nation became almost overnight the world's largest creditor and most powerful competitor. Our foreign trade amounted in 1928 to \$9,219,939,000, or nearly three times the amount in 1910. Our investments in foreign countries at the close of the calendar year 1928 had increased to \$14,555,000,000 from only \$8,105,000,000 in 1923. Our shipping has doubled; American banks and chambers of commerce are scattered all over the world; the number of our people who travel to foreign lands every year is nearly

three times the number of those who went abroad before the war. More and more are international questions adjusted through international conferences. No important conference of nations now takes place without the participation of the United States having been invited * * *. No important question affecting the peace of the world, the freedom of commerce, the cooperation of nations in respect to great humanitarian enterprises is settled without affording the United States an opportunity to be heard. The participation of the United States in international affairs has become a matter of vital importance, both to the American people and to the people of other countries * * *. Moreover, every American who goes abroad and every shipment of American goods to a foreign port and every dollar of American money invested abroad constitutes an actual or potential problem for the Department of State and its agents abroad. As more American citizens, more American goods, and more American money go abroad, the number of American citizens and enterprises that meet with accident and misadventure and the call upon American official agencies for assistance or protection increase.

So you see that these men, whose duty it is to handle our great business abroad and to give advice and assistance to travelers, are receiving a very small compensation for their work, yet are not classified. I feel that if we could classify these men and give them more salary it would be an incentive to get many more good men to enter the service and make the work their permanent career. At present we are losing many from the service who go to civil employment where the chances are so much better than the low salaries and uncertain employment under Government employ.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Will you tell us how many resigned from the service as the result of the inadequate salaries they receive?

Mr. LINTHICUM. In answer to the question of the gentleman from New York I will say that for the period extending from 1925 to 1929 there was a turnover of 116 per cent, and in the Consular Service 119 per cent during the same period.

Mr. EDWARDS. What does the gentleman mean by the "turnover"?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I mean 119 per cent of all those in the Consular Service from 1925 to 1929 resigned and 116 per cent of those in the other branches resigned and new ones took their positions.

Mr. EDWARDS. They resigned their positions?

Mr. LINTHICUM. They resigned because they could not live on their salaries and because there was no career for them on the present basis.

Mr. EDWARDS. Are these clerks in any instance under civil service?

Mr. LINTHICUM. They are not under civil service, but they are under a very strict efficiency system which the Department of State conducts.

Mr. EDWARDS. Why should not the civil service have some control of these appointments, or at least some touch with them, as well as all other governmental appointments of clerks?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I should say because it is not in accordance with the Constitution. The Constitution places these matters in the hands of the President. He has the appointment of all ambassadors, ministers, consuls, and in turn, all clerks in the service.

Mr. EDWARDS. There is, however, some form of civil service?

Mr. LINTHICUM. There is a form of civil service, promulgated by the President through the Department of State, but not the general civil service of which we generally speak.

I feel that if this bill is passed we will establish a definite salary basis so that a man who makes good in the service will receive promotion and some additional salary. It would remove the limitation as to foreign clerks in the service, enabling them to receive more salary and permanence in the service. It can readily be seen just how hard it must be to procure efficient clerks at less than \$1,000, according to the law of 1906 which provided that limitation.

Now, ladies and gentlemen of the House, this bill is not going to cost the Government very much money. Mr. Carr, Assistant Secretary of State, in reporting the appropriation for 1931, estimated that there would be an increase of \$105,452 for 1931, which is not a very large one.

It must be remembered that the Foreign Service brings into the Treasury some \$7,000,000 a year from passports and fees of various kinds, so that it pays a large part of its own expense. This does not apply to many of the other departments of the Government. This \$105,000 would be a small item in comparison with such revenue as it brings in.

Moreover, Congress does not lose control of this. Congress can regulate the salaries. It is first recommended by the de-

partment to the Bureau of the Budget. The Bureau of the Budget goes over it and brings it to the Appropriations Committee. The Appropriations Committee brings it into Congress. So that Congress loses no control over the salaries or other provisions in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I think that inasmuch as the report filed is in such detail and gives such complete information, both as to the salaries and to the classification, it would be useless for me to make any extended remarks. Any Member can see from the report just what the bill is intended to do. The prime thing which the bill is intended to do is to classify this service in accordance with the classification made in the Rogers Act for the career men. It places the noncareer men in a classified service, just as the Rogers Act placed the career service men, and carries out that work.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I yield.

Mr. ACKERMAN. Does not the gentleman think that this would vastly increase the morale of every one of the clerks who would receive the additional compensation, and the benefit to the United States would be a hundredfold by reason of giving them our support in this measure?

Mr. LINTHICUM. In reply to what the gentleman from New Jersey says, it will benefit the Government very largely in being able to tell the men, "Now, if you enter this service you are entering a classified service. You have a career before you. You have a chance to advance if you are efficient." I think a satisfied clerkship in the Diplomatic and Consular Service will be a wonderful benefit to the Government, and there will not be the turnover which now exists and which is most detrimental and expensive to the Government.

Mr. ACKERMAN. The gentleman has seen many of these officials abroad, and knows how faithfully they work in behalf of the Government, often at very meager salaries, and they have received practically no consideration up to the present time.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I will say to the gentleman that the clerks in the service do all the detail work. A man may come and see the consul or the ambassador, or the minister, but, finally he is referred to the clerk to carry out instructions and he is the one who helps the traveler or business man. I know of numbers of instances where these men are really running the consulate; where they are the chief men in charge, the consul being away or the deputy being in charge.

Mr. ACKERMAN. I can also testify to the same thing, as I have seen it a number of times abroad.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I know the gentleman from New Jersey has traveled all over the world, and has been in contact with these men in this matter, as well as in matters applying to the Department of Commerce.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I yield.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. With reference to one question which was asked a little while ago, the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Carr, explained very fully to the committee that there is a rigid examination of applicants for this service, before they are appointed.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Oh, yes; and after they are in the service a record is kept, and they also advance under this bill upon an efficiency basis depending on the record they make in their work.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I would like to suggest another thing which the gentleman may perhaps have mentioned, that Secretary of State Stimson addressed a lengthy communication to the committee urging the importance of this action.

Mr. LINTHICUM. That is quite true. I should like to say, also, and I thank the gentleman from Virginia for calling my attention to it, that not only is the President in favor of this bill, but the Department of State, and I think everyone who has come in contact with it.

I would like to ask the gentlemen of the committee if they have an opportunity to read the latter part of the report called the addenda, showing what people in the service have said from all over the world, all recommending this bill.

In addition to that I have quite a number of letters from young men asking me whether they should continue in the service, and I have told them in every case to stay in and make a good record; that better times are ahead. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Appointments to the grade of senior clerks and advancement from class to class in that grade shall hereafter be by promotion for efficient service, and no one shall be promoted to the grade of senior

clerk who is not an American citizen and has not served as a clerk in a diplomatic mission or a consulate, or both, or as a clerk in the Department of State for at least five years.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LAGUARDIA: Page 2, line 7, strike out the words "to the grade of senior clerk."

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would carry out what I have been endeavoring to do for some years—that is, to give American citizens an opportunity and the preference in clerical positions in this service. I understand there are some clerks in the service now who are not American citizens. The committee bill provides that no clerk shall be promoted to the grade of senior clerk who is not an American citizen. My amendment would make the bill read:

And no one shall be promoted who is not an American citizen.

That is the only change. In that way the committee can protect any clerk who is now in the service who is not a citizen, and gradually they would be weeded out.

Mr. COLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. COLE. I think the gentleman will concede that very often one who is not an American citizen can serve our Government better by reason of being acquainted with the language of the foreign country and with the customs.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Oh, no; that is not so. I served at Budapest, Hungary, 26 years ago as clerk in the consulate, and I was compelled to study Serbian, while the consul, himself a Bostonian and a graduate from Harvard, studied and learned Hungarian.

Mr. BLOOM. There has been a change since then.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. You bet there has been a change—a change for the better. We are paying better salaries now. We have more young men going into the service, young men who can acquire knowledge of foreign languages. It is foolish to say that an American young man can not acquire a knowledge of a foreign language. Our young men go abroad, and they do acquire knowledge of foreign languages just as well as anyone else.

Mr. COLE. The gentleman will admit it often happens that an American who has this foreign-language knowledge is not available at a particular point.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Under your bill a noncitizen could be appointed to the grade of junior clerk only and he could not be appointed to the grade of senior clerk. That is the bill as it is drawn.

Mr. COLE. I think that is correct.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I would simply limit promotions in the service to American citizens, which is the logical thing to do. I will say to the gentleman that several of the colleges of this country have courses in foreign service and diplomacy, and if we give American citizens a chance we can certainly fill all of these places with American citizens.

Mr. COLE. If this bill is passed and the pay is increased the chances are we will be able to get Americans in the service. One reason why we have had so much difficulty in the past is because we have not paid salaries sufficient for Americans to live on in foreign countries.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is quite true.

Mr. BLOOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. BLOOM. Does not the gentleman think that should be left to the discretion of the State Department?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. No; I do not. I do not think it ought to be left to the discretion of the State Department any more than you would put noncitizens in the Customs Service, the Treasury Department, or any other department of the Government. If it is desirable to have lackeys and valets to act as guides to some of our citizens that is one thing, but if you want self-respecting American citizens to represent this country abroad, then you ought to give these men a chance, and this will be an opening by which they can enter the Consular Service.

Mr. FISH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. FISH. Does the gentleman's amendment apply to all foreigners in our service?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It applies to promotions. The amendment provides that promotions shall be limited to American citizens. The bill limits promotions to the grade of senior clerk to American citizens.

Mr. BLOOM. Would not that prevent them from going into the junior grade?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I do not think so.

Mr. BLOOM. Where are you going to get your men to go abroad?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. You can get all the young men you want from our colleges to go into the service.

Mr. BLOOM. You would have difficulty in getting them.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I do not think so. The gentleman knows that in his city and my city there are lots of men who can not go into the Consular Service, and if the gentleman desires me to amplify that I will do so. I will say right now there is a certain prejudice in the State Department against the appointment of a certain class of young men from our city, and the gentleman ought to know that.

Mr. BLOOM. I do not know anything of the kind.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I will say that right now, and I am trying to open the doors to those young men.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Does the gentleman's amendment in any way bar the employment of foreign clerks in the lower grades where, because of language requirements or something of that kind, a foreign clerk is desirable?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. It would not; but it would bar them from promotion. Suppose you do have a noncitizen clerk and a citizen clerk in a consulate. The citizen clerk could acquire the language and he would be given the preference on promotions.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. The thought I had in mind is that it would be embarrassing if by some inelastic provision you made it impossible to render the service that is required at some particular place.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. My amendment would not do that. I believe the time has arrived when our colleges are producing young men who speak foreign languages. This thing of foreign languages is no longer a mystery, such as was the case at one time. It is not so difficult for a young man to acquire a knowledge of foreign languages.

We have student interpreters studying the oriental languages all the time in our consulates and embassies, and there is no reason why the young men can not have an opportunity to enter the service; but there is a distinct prejudice in the Department of State against certain young men. Now, let us be frank about it. Let us be perfectly frank about it. They have an oral examination and that is where they flunk anyone who does not meet their personal likes or dislikes.

I will concede that the State Department is getting a very splendid set of young men in the service, but we want to make the Consular and Diplomatic Service a typical American service and open to all who can qualify without discrimination. Of course, if some gentlemen when they go abroad, because they have no social standing of their own, want to be taken around to tea parties, that is another question. I am not interested in that.

Mr. LINTHICUM. How about cocktail parties?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The American boys will attend to that.

To have efficient clerks who may be trained into becoming consuls or secretaries of embassies, I say we ought to give the opportunity to American boys.

Mr. GREEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. GREEN. I hope the gentleman will offer an amendment to that effect.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I have offered the amendment and it is pending, and we will have a vote on it on a motion to recommit if it is not agreed to in committee.

Mr. GREEN. When we find we can not secure American citizens to do this work, then it will be plenty of time to go into foreign fields.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Exactly.

Mr. GREEN. There are 5,000,000 of our people out of employment. Every day I get letters from my district begging for jobs. They would come here for \$20 a week, and a similar situation exists all over the United States, and yet we are spending American money to hire foreigners.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Every leading college in the country has a regular course for this service, and I hope the committee will

adopt my amendment. If it does not, we will give the House an opportunity to pass on it on a motion to recommit.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, the bill without the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New York provides that no clerk who is not an American citizen shall hereafter be appointed to serve in a diplomatic mission. The distinction, of course, being between the Diplomatic Service and the Consular Service. Hereafter appointments of foreigners, if this bill passes, may be made only to clerkships in the Consular Service where there is a great deal of commercial business to be done between business concerns of the United States and those of foreign countries. The very first thing that is desirable is that the clerk of the consulate know the language not as he learns it in the school but as it is spoken on the streets and in business affairs. I am reminded of Chaucer's line about the quality of the French spoken by one of the personages in his Canterbury Tales:

And French she spake full faire and fetysly,
After the school of Stratford atte Bowe;
For French of Paris was to her unknowe.

So a good many of the boys who learn foreign languages in our colleges know the classroom language and they do not know the current, colloquial, half-slang, or full-slang expressions used in ordinary affairs. We need clerks that know the language intimately, know it as their mother tongue. We provide that none of them shall be promoted beyond the grade of junior clerk even in the consulates, and none shall be appointed at all in the Diplomatic Service who are not American citizens.

I do not believe the amendment of the gentleman from New York is necessary.

Mr. COLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEMPLE. Yes.

Mr. COLE. Not only is a knowledge of the language required, but they need men who understand the customs of the country to which they are assigned.

Mr. TEMPLE. Yes; and have contacts with the persons with whom they are doing business.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEMPLE. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. In all fairness—and the gentlemen are all familiar with conditions—how many nonsubjects of their country has the consulate or the embassy of France or Belgium or England or Italy or Germany in the United States outside of stenographers and purely clerical help? They employ their own subjects.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I may say to the gentleman there are a great many of them who are not their own nationals.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The gentleman from Iowa takes the stand it is impossible for an American citizen to go abroad and acquaint himself with conditions there and establish contacts there.

Mr. COLE. No; I do not take that position; but I believe that the men the gentleman has in mind are not always available.

Mr. TEMPLE. The bill does not take the position referred to by the gentleman from New York, I am sure.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEMPLE. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. This very point was discussed when we had hearings before the committee, and the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Carr, was interrogated on it, and this is what he said:

All I can say as to that is what men on the spot say about it. The best of our men, the men who are doing the most for American trade in our service, are men who advocate the retention of the present system and the use of foreign clerks, because of their language abilities and contacts, etc., in subordinate positions.

Now, the fact is that these subordinate positions are so subordinate that they are restricted to a salary of not more than \$1,000 per annum.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Oh, not at all; if the gentleman is familiar with his own bill he will find that the junior clerks are paid \$2,500, and below that he can appoint his noncitizens. My amendment simply prevents the promotion of these noncitizens to the higher grades.

Mr. TEMPLE. There are 1,356 foreigners in the service now.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. That is just 1,000 too many.

Mr. TEMPLE. And the officers in the field think they are necessary.

Mr. PALMER. I am inclined to think that the LaGuardia amendment is a good one. I think the gentleman is right. We certainly have a sufficient number of American citizens, and, as the gentleman has said, I think there are just 1,000 too many

foreigners employed. I believe the gentleman's amendment should be adopted.

Mr. TEMPLE. The bill as it stands, Mr. Chairman, provides there shall be no promotion to the senior grade of anyone who is not an American citizen. The junior grade is divided into first, second, and third classes. The amendment, if it carries, would provide that no junior clerk shall be promoted to a higher class even within the junior grade unless he is an American citizen.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the gentleman from Virginia has read to you what the Assistant Secretary of State, Mr. Carr, the best-informed man in the Government service, has to say about this question. I do not know how long he has been in the department, but certainly more than 20 years.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I served under him 26 years ago.

Mr. LINTHICUM. The gentleman from New York says that he served under him 26 years ago, and I have no doubt very satisfactorily, indeed. Mr. Carr advises against this amendment. We have 1,356 foreign clerks in the service, and we pay them on an average \$780 per annum. It is recommended that their salaries be increased from \$720 and \$817 per annum to \$780 and \$840, making a total of \$105,452.

I want to say to the gentleman from New York—and I agree with him on general principles—that you could not get an American to go abroad for less than \$2,000.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I want to leave these 225 places open to American citizens.

Mr. LINTHICUM. If you calculate this you will find that this difference will amount to some \$1,750,000 which must be appropriated in order to fill these places with American citizens. Mr. Carr tells me, and I know it has been his work right along, that the foreign clerks are being eliminated just as fast as it is possible to do it in the interest of the service. I am sure if the gentleman does not insist on his amendment he will find that in time we shall have none but American citizens except where it is absolutely necessary. I am just as anxious as the gentleman from New York to eliminate all foreign clerks possible, but it must be left to the department to do that gradually, with regard to efficiency. The bill already prohibits their promotion to the senior grade.

Mr. GREEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LINTHICUM. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. I was wondering to what extent foreign nations employ American citizens here in their consulates and legations. Is it not negligible?

Mr. LINTHICUM. No; they employ a good many. Most of these clerks are stenographers and underclerks. You must have some men of the nationality where the office is located in order to make contacts and get trade reports, which the American citizens can not get as well. Mr. Carr says that it is absolutely necessary.

Mr. GREEN. Let me give the gentleman a little experience—there is a young woman from my State in this city to-day, an expert in three languages, and she can not get a position at any price.

Mr. LINTHICUM. What would she take as a salary to go abroad?

Mr. GREEN. If the gentleman knows how a Democrat is received in the State Department—we are Democrats.

Mr. LINTHICUM. If it is a case of being a Democrat, that is a different proposition, which no bill could well remedy. I am in that class myself.

Mr. STAFFORD. That has no application in appointments in the classified Foreign Service.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Is it not a fact that Mr. Carr testified before our committee that foreign embassies and legations in this country employ Americans for clerical work, and that they could hardly get along without doing so?

Mr. LINTHICUM. The gentleman is absolutely right. I hope the committee will vote down the amendment and leave this question to the department, who will surely handle it in the interest of our Government.

Mr. EDWARDS. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EDWARDS. Is the time for debate on this bill to be divided equally between those who are for and those who are against the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. That is within the discretion of the Chair.

Mr. EDWARDS. I am in favor of this amendment, and I would like to be heard.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will first recognize the gentleman from New York [Mr. Fish].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. This whole question was carefully considered by the

committee. I think there is some little misunderstanding on the part of some Members of the House as to the common practice. The common practice among civilized nations is to employ in a clerical capacity the natives of the country where embassies, legations, and consulates are located.

What we should at least consider here is, first, what is for the best interests of our Diplomatic and Consular Service. It must be self-evident to you that it is in the interest of our service to hire clerks, not only natives of the country, but natives of the city in which the consulates are situated.

These foreign clerks are better qualified to obtain information from foreign industries, and a large part of the work of our consulates is to provide facts regarding the commerce and trade in foreign cities and countries. The alien clerks not only know the language but know their way around and can get information that American citizens would never be able to secure. These alien clerks know the heads of factories, and they can go there and immediately get the information that is needed and furnish it through our consulates to American manufacturers to build up our foreign trade. They become almost fact-finding secretaries or clerks and of great value to our expanding trade with foreign countries.

Mr. BLOOM. And they must know the English language and our ways, and all about our country, just the same as their own country.

Mr. FISH. Certainly. I have, I admit, almost a personal interest in this issue, due to the fact that I happened to go to school abroad with one of these alien clerks who is now located in the American consulate in Geneva, Switzerland. He is the son of our old schoolmaster and is a young man of very high type. He has been in our consulate in Geneva for a good many years, receiving the munificent salary of \$1,000 a year, which is the maximum salary our Government pays to our foreign clerks. This bill, if it goes into effect, will permit him to get a slight increase in salary, perhaps a few hundred dollars, but nothing in any way adequate to the service that he has rendered our country in the way of getting information which has been invaluable for the promotion of our trade and commerce.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. In case of any conflict between this country and a foreign country, is not the legation in a rather delicate position because of having natives employed in confidential positions in relation with the diplomatic service?

Mr. FISH. Oh, the people that I refer to are in consulates. They are not in our diplomatic service. They have no alien clerks in confidential capacity in our embassies or legations. That is another question entirely. This has to do with our consulates, dealing with trade and commerce. I hope the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] will not prevail, because it will be unfair to much needed and valuable clerks and will be a handicap to our trade and commerce. It must be self-evident that you can not send a boy from Washington or New York over to Geneva, Switzerland, and expect him to know all about the commerce of Geneva and of Switzerland in a few years, irrespective of his gift for languages. We are trying to promote commerce and trade through our consulates, and the proposed amendment would be destructive of the present high degree of efficiency.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. All my amendment does is to give preference in promotion to American citizens. From the gentleman's remarks I can see that my amendment might interfere with his school friend.

Mr. FISH. Yes; and with hundreds of others in similar situations who have and still are rendering faithful and important service in American consulates throughout the world. Of course, I, like everyone else, wants to put American citizens in where they are qualified, but what American citizen is going over there to serve for a \$1,000 a year and render comparable service as foreign clerks in return?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. He will if he has a career ahead of him.

Mr. FISH. Some people talk about what other nations do. Every foreign nation employs American citizens over here, and, furthermore, they do not stop at the senior grade for clerks, to which we limit promotion in this bill, but go as high as financial and executive officers. You find American financial and other advisers all over the world—not only here, but high up in embassies in Japan, Siam, and in legations either in Washington or in foreign lands. I think the committee has done a good job. Their action has been approved and recommended by the State Department, and I hope the House will not support the amendment of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA], for the reason that unless we hold out some hope to our American young men and women who are eligible for this service we are going to handicap them. The argument by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] and by others, for that matter, that foreign talent is more efficient than American talent is not sound. I am not ready to admit that, but, to the contrary, I believe the American citizen is the most efficient to be found for this service.

Mr. O'CONNELL. It is sound, if they know the language and our American boys do not.

Mr. EDWARDS. The gentleman touches the point "if they know the language." Let us encourage American citizens, native and foreign born, to study languages and be efficient.

Mr. O'CONNELL. That is what this bill does.

Mr. EDWARDS. This bill without this amendment would destroy their hope in that respect. The amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] is good, because it will prevent the promotion of anyone in our Foreign Service except American citizens.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Does the gentleman not think that this country, in certain parts of it, should undertake the burden of getting our own so-called Americans to study the English language?

Mr. EDWARDS. Yes; and I will say further that a lot of the foreign representatives of the American Government after they have been in foreign countries for a while and return to this country can hardly be understood because they are so affected with foreign accents and ways. We need more Americanism in this Government, and we should never miss an opportunity to shoot it into our governmental services whenever we can. I do not know of a nation in the world that has any finer or more efficient citizenship than we have, or that even approaches it. We have the ability, so why say to American boys and girls that these places are not for them but are open to aliens who are not American citizens. There are now over 1,300 people who are not American citizens in these positions.

Mr. GREEN. Does the gentleman not think that if we encourage the American boys and girls in this way we will help the unemployment situation in this country?

Mr. EDWARDS. Absolutely.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Does the gentleman also realize that in many foreign consulates in this country, in New York and other places, many American citizens are employed?

Mr. EDWARDS. That is all right; I am not against that; but I am in favor of giving preference to American citizens, whether native born or naturalized. I am for Americans first.

Mr. O'CONNELL. The gentleman believes that they should employ our citizens, but that we should not employ theirs?

Mr. EDWARDS. Yes; if they want to follow that policy, but I am for putting American citizens in our Foreign Service. Here is a provision in this bill that bears out the thought the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] has in mind. It is on page 2 of the bill:

SEC. 2. Appointments to the grade of senior clerks and advancement from class to class in that grade shall hereafter be by promotion for efficient service, and no one shall be promoted to the grade of senior clerk who is not an American citizen and has not served as a clerk in a diplomatic mission or a consulate, or both, or as a clerk in the Department of State for at least five years.

If it is good in that instance, it is good in the other. It should apply also in the class of clerks his amendment would affect.

Mr. LINTHICUM. The gentleman ought to take into consideration that a great majority of these people are typists and stenographers. Also, I think he should take into consideration the fact that a foreigner can get certain information in a certain city and country that one of our people, no matter how good French or Italian or Spanish he could talk, could not get.

Mr. EDWARDS. Oh, the American equals any of them, and should have the preference in our Foreign Service.

Mr. O'CONNELL. You would talk to an American much more freely than to anybody else.

Mr. EDWARDS. Yes; and there is also the question of loyalty involved in this matter. We should do as George Washington said, "Put no man on guard to-night but Americans." [Applause.] That is our need now. We need Americans on guard now and all the while. I am for the amendment because I am for America and believe she can be best served in these positions by her own citizens. We might just as well meet this thing right now and fight it out. The amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA] will serve a good purpose. It gives preference to our own citizens. You have already

provided for American citizens in the senior class. I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York will prevail and be effective as to the other class of clerks provided for in this bill. [Applause.]

Mr. GREEN and Mr. STAFFORD rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Florida against the amendment?

Mr. GREEN. No; I am for the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will first recognize the gentleman from Florida for five minutes.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I probably shall not use the entire five minutes, but I have in mind one picture when I vote for this amendment, and my colleagues have probably had the same experience. Hardly a day passes but some one either stops me on the street or comes to my office and appeals to me for money to buy the next meal. Do you mean to tell me that when the financial condition of the country is such and when the industrial condition of American citizens is such that there are 5,000,000, approximately, out of employment, and when men come in my office asking me for any kind of a position that I can possibly secure for them—some of them college graduates and some of them high-school graduates—and saying that the amount to be paid is not to be considered, whether it is \$5 a week or \$10 a week or \$100 a month, I can reconcile my conscience to vote for a bill that will carry a million or so dollars of additional American money to pay foreigners salaries for service which can be performed by American citizens who are ready and willing to go to those countries if they have the opportunity?

It is all right to talk about expanding business, and it is all right to talk about the welfare of the various departments, but when it comes to the time when our own people are suffering, then it is time for you to remember the American citizen rather than the foreigner.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. The gentleman has made a forcible argument, but—

Mr. GREEN. I could probably name in my own district a thousand young men under the age of 25 who are high-school graduates who would promptly sign up to go a year to those stations for a year's salary.

Mr. DENISON. Do you think the other countries would do the same thing?

Mr. GREEN. They are doing it. You can go to the various departments of our Government here and abroad and you will find that more good American money is paid to foreigners than you will find other nations paying here to American citizens, I believe. The United States is a Santa Claus to all those foreign countries; we are giving them far more than we are getting. Our American high schools and colleges are turning out annually thousands of young men and women, American citizens, who can speak foreign languages and who are in every way qualified for these positions, who are without employment, and who desire just such positions, and as for me, I am going to vote to give it to them. My country's affairs are far safer in the hands of employees who are American citizens. I shall vote for this amendment providing for their employment and promotion. They have helped to make America great and strong and are entitled to American protection and benefits. I stand for employment of Americans by Americans. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, this is the most un-American amendment that I know of as ever having been proposed in the House of Representatives. It purports to be American, but it does not read Americanism. It spells narrow provincialism. It indicates bigotry. It does not realize that the United States of America is a Nation among nations, that it is not a little puritanical state or colony.

The amendment seeks to bar from the service of the United States in foreign countries everyone who happens to be native to that soil and not an American citizen. It is the narrowest of narrow propaganda that I ever heard enunciated on the floor of Congress.

I am surprised that the erstwhile ultraliberal from New York City would espouse and propose such a provincial amendment. I have heretofore regarded the gentleman as a liberal.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. The gentleman has not yet caught the purpose of my amendment. I myself have served in the Consular Service, and I know what I am talking about.

Mr. STAFFORD. I have visited consular offices in other countries, and I know something about what I am talking about.

What is the purport of the gentleman's amendment? Every foreigner who is serving in a clerical position in a foreign country would have no incentive whatever to do efficient work as being without hope for promotion because of this restrictive amendment.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. A New York boy has not a chance to get one of these positions.

Mr. STAFFORD. The Milwaukee boy or the Milwaukee girl has a chance to get these jobs that are open to all; and I will say to the gentleman from Florida that these positions are not distributed according to politics. Politics is unknown down in the State Department, but efficiency is known.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. When the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] was describing this amendment as being bigoted and narrow, I thought the gentleman was going to add that it had a hood on it with a cross in front.

Mr. STAFFORD. Well, it has a shroud, benignly white, but underneath dark in its sinister purposes.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Would it not be consistent to follow it up and say that "Nobody shall be employed unless he be born in this country"?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Nothing of the kind, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR] should know it, and the gentleman should know better if he does not know better.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] will not dispute the fact that where it is necessary in the work of administration of foreign service abroad to employ natives, there will be no possibility of advancement or promotion. Is that not the effect of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA]?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. For aliens?

Mr. STAFFORD. For aliens; yes.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Exactly. What is wrong with that?

Mr. STAFFORD. Conditions abroad, in many cases, even in Canada, are such that it is not possible to get American citizens to perform this service. They may be remote. This great service, which is bottomed on efficiency, would be crippled by refusing to allow natives in those countries to have any prospect of promotion by having their salaries raised.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes, of course, as I am attacking the gentlemen's amendment.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. The argument for the necessity of these aliens is their knowledge of languages. I suppose an American can not speak the language spoken in Canada?

Mr. STAFFORD. I have said sufficient, Mr. Chairman, to show the un-American character of this amendment that is being paraded around under the guise of Americanism.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] has expired.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and upon a division (demanded by Mr. STAFFORD) there were—ayes 10, noes 40.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill without amendment, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MICHENER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9110) for the grading and classification of clerks in the Foreign Service of the United States of America, and providing compensation therefor, had directed him to report the same back to the House without amendment, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA] opposed to the bill?

Mr. LA GUARDIA. As the bill is now drawn, I am.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LA GUARDIA moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, with instructions to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 2, line 7, after the word "promoted," strike out the words "to the grade of senior clerk."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit. The question was taken; and upon a division (demanded by Mr. LAGUARDIA) there were—ayes 7, noes 45.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is not a quorum present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 79, nays 210, not voting 138, as follows:

[Roll No. 45]

YEAS—79

Abernethy	Doxey	Hull, Wis.	Quin
Almon	Driver	Johnson, Okla.	Ragon
Bland	Edwards	Jones, Tex.	Ramspeck
Bowman	Englebright	Kemp	Rankin
Box	Estlick	Kendall, Pa.	Rutherford
Brand, Ga.	Fisher	Kincheloe	Sanders, Tex.
Brand, Ohio	Fulmer	Kvale	Sandlin
Busby	Garber, Okla.	LaGuardia	Shaffer, Va.
Byrns	Gasque	Lankford, Ga.	Smith, W. Va.
Canfield	Glover	Larsen	Spearing
Clark, N. C.	Green	Ludlow	Sproul, Kans.
Collins	Greenwood	McKeown	Stone
Connelly	Gregory	McMillan	Tarver
Cooper, Tenn.	Hall, Ill.	McSwain	Vinson, Ga.
Cox	Halsey	Moore, Ky.	Weich, Calif.
Crisp	Hammer	O'Connor, La.	Williams
Davis	Hare	Oldfield	Wilson
DeRouen	Hastings	Palmer	Wolverton, W. Va.
Doughton	Hill, Wash.	Parks	Wright
Dowell	Hull, Tenn.	Patman	

NAYS—210

Ackerman	Eaton, N. J.	Ketcham	Rogers
Adkins	Elliott	Kieffer	Romjue
Aldrich	Esterly	Kopp	Rowbottom
Allen	Evans, Mont.	Korell	Sanders, N. Y.
Andresen	Fish	Lambertson	Schafer, Wis.
Andrew	Fitzgerald	Langley	Schneider
Arentz	Fitzpatrick	Lankford, Va.	Sears
Arnold	Foss	Lea	Seger
Auf der Heide	Freeman	Leavitt	Selberling
Ayres	French	Lehlbach	Selvig
Bacharach	Fuller	Letts	Shott, W. Va.
Bacon	Gambrell	Linthicum	Simmons
Beedy	Garner	Lozler	Simms
Bloom	Garrett	Luce	Sinclair
Bohn	Gibson	McClintic, Okla.	Sloan
Bolton	Gifford	McClintock, Ohio	Smith, Idaho
Briggs	Goodwin	McCormack, Mass.	Snell
Brigham	Granfield	McLaughlin	Snow
Browne	Guyer	McLeod	Somers, N. Y.
Buchanan	Hadley	Maas	Speaks
Buckbee	Hale	Manlove	Sproul, Ill.
Burtness	Hall, Ind.	Mansfield	Stafford
Butler	Hall, Miss.	Mapes	Stalker
Campbell, Iowa	Hall, N. Dak.	Martin	Stobbs
Carter, Wyo.	Hancock	Michaelson	Strong, Pa.
Chalmers	Hardy	Michener	Sullivan, N. Y.
Chindblom	Hartley	Miller	Summers, Wash.
Christgau	Haugen	Milligan	Summers, Tex.
Christopherson	Hess	Moore, Ohio	Swanson
Clague	Hickey	Moore, Va.	Swing
Clancy	Hill, Ala.	Morehead	Taber
Cochran, Mo.	Hoch	Morgan	Temple
Cochran, Pa.	Hoffman	Nelson, Me.	Thatcher
Cole	Hogg	Nelson, Mo.	Thurston
Colton	Hooper	Newhall	Tilson
Cooke	Hope	Nolan	Tinkham
Cooper, Ohio	Hopkins	Norton	Treadway
Cooper, Wis.	Houston, Del.	O'Connell	Underhill
Corning	Howard	O'Connor, N. Y.	Wainwright
Coyne	Huddleston	O'Connor, Okla.	Walker
Craff	Hull, Morton D.	Oliver, N. Y.	Wason
Cramton	Irwin	Owen	Whitley
Cross	Johnson, Ind.	Palmsano	Whittington
Crosser	Johnson, Nebr.	Parker	Wigglesworth
Culkin	Johnson, S. Dak.	Perkins	Williamson
Dallinger	Johnson, Tex.	Pittenger	Wolverton, N. J.
Darrow	Johnson, Wash.	Prall	Woodruff
Davenport	Johnston, Mo.	Pratt, Harcourt J.	Woodrum
Denison	Jonas, N. C.	Pratt, Ruth	Wurzbach
Dickstein	Kading	Rainey, Henry T.	Yates
Douglas, Ariz.	Kahn	Ramseyer	Zihlman
Douglas, Mass.	Kendall, Ky.	Reed, N. Y.	
Eaton, Colo.	Kennedy	Reid, Ill.	

NOT VOTING—138

Allgood	Campbell, Pa.	Dominick	Goldsborough
Aswell	Cannon	Doutrich	Graham
Bachmann	Carley	Doyle	Griffin
Baird	Carter, Calif.	Drane	Hawley
Bankhead	Cartwright	Drewry	Holaday
Barbour	Celler	Dunbar	Hudson
Beck	Chase	Dyer	Hudspeth
Beers	Clark, Md.	Ellis	Hull, William E.
Bell	Clarke, N. Y.	Estep	Igoe
Black	Collier	Evans, Calif.	James
Blackburn	Connolly	Fenn	Jeffers
Boylan	Craddock	Finley	Jenkins
Britten	Crowther	Fort	Johnson, Ill.
Browning	Cullen	Frear	Kearns
Brumm	Curry	Free	Kelly
Brunner	Dempsey	Garber, Va.	Kerr
Burdick	De Priest	Gavagan	Kless
Cable	Dickinson	Golder	Kinzer

Knutson	Mooney	Robinson	Turpin
Kunz	Mouser	Sabath	Underwood
Kurtz	Murphy	Short, Mo.	Vestal
Lampert	Nelson, Wis.	Shreve	Vincent, Mich.
Lanham	Niedringhaus	Sirovich	Warren
Leech	Oliver, Ala.	Sparks	Watres
Lindsay	Patterson	Stegall	Watson
McCormick, Ill.	Peavey	Stedman	Welsh, Pa.
McDuffie	Porter	Stevenson	White
McFadden	Pou	Strong, Kans.	Whitehead
McReynolds	Pritchard	Sullivan, Pa.	Wingo
Magrady	Purnell	Swick	Wolfenden
Mead	Quayle	Taylor, Colo.	Wood
Menges	Ramey, Frank M.	Taylor, Tenn.	Wyant
Merritt	Ransley	Thompson	Yon
Montague	Rayburn	Timberlake	
Montet	Reece	Tucker	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Graham with Mr. Pou.
 Mr. Crowther with Mr. Bell.
 Mr. Golder with Mr. Lanham.
 Mr. Purnell with Mr. Collier.
 Mr. Free with Mr. Lindsay.
 Mr. Barbour with Mr. Steagall.
 Mr. Ransley with Mr. Drane.
 Mr. Short of Missouri with Mr. Black.
 Mr. Carter of California with Mr. Mooney.
 Mr. Shreve with Mr. Tucker.
 Mr. McFadden with Mr. Cullen.
 Mr. Dyer with Mr. Wingo.
 Mr. Fenn with Mr. Stevenson.
 Mr. Ellis with Mr. Carley.
 Mr. Menges with Mr. Dominick.
 Mr. Dempsey with Mr. Rayburn.
 Mr. Kiess with Mr. Brunner.
 Mr. Britten with Mr. Warren.
 Mr. Connolly with Mr. Quayle.
 Mr. Frear with Mr. Yon.
 Mr. Porter with Mr. Boylan.
 Mr. Beers with Mr. Bankhead.
 Mr. Holaday with Mr. Mead.
 Mr. Blackburn with Mr. Underwood.
 Mr. Hawley with Mr. Griffin.
 Mr. Campbell of Pennsylvania with Mr. Taylor of Colorado.
 Mr. Swick with Mr. Kunz.
 Mr. Doutrich with Mr. Gavagan.
 Mr. Niedringhaus with Mr. Montague.
 Mr. Wood with Mr. Allgood.
 Mr. Murphy with Mr. McDuffie.
 Mr. Watson with Mr. Celler.
 Mr. Merritt with Mr. Oliver of Alabama.
 Mr. Welsh of Pennsylvania with Mr. Aswell.
 Mr. Vincent of Michigan with Mr. McReynolds.
 Mr. Kurtz with Mr. Sabath.
 Mr. Vestal with Mr. Drewry.
 Mr. Turpin with Mr. Montet.
 Mr. Kearns with Mr. Whitehead.
 Mr. Thompson with Mr. Jeffers.
 Mr. James with Mr. Browning.
 Mr. Timberlake with Mr. Cannon.
 Mr. Reece with Mr. Patterson.
 Mr. Garber of Virginia with Mr. Cartwright.
 Mr. Taylor of Tennessee with Mr. Stedman.
 Mr. Bachmann with Mr. Sirovich.
 Mr. Clarke of New York with Mr. Cox.
 Mr. Beck with Mr. Goldsborough.
 Mr. Evans of California with Mr. Hudspeth.
 Mr. Finley with Mr. Kerr.
 Mr. Dunbar with Mr. Igoe.
 Mr. Dickinson with Mr. Doyle.
 Mr. De Priest with Mr. Magrady.
 Mr. Estep with Mr. Mouser.
 Mr. Lampert with Mr. Wyant.
 Mr. Johnson of Illinois with Mr. Nelson of Wisconsin.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill. The question was taken, and the bill was passed.

On motion of Mr. TEMPLE, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT—RETIREMENT OF EMPLOYEES IN THE CLASSIFIED CIVIL SERVICE

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, I submit a conference report for printing under the rule on the bill (S. 15) to amend the act entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes,' approved May 22, 1920, and acts in amendment thereof," approved July 3, 1926, as amended. Pending that, Mr. Speaker, I desire to proffer a unanimous-consent request. One of the managers on the part of the Senate signed the conference report with a statement, and at his request I ask unanimous consent that this statement be printed in the RECORD immediately following the conference report and the statement by the managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey submits a conference report for printing under the rule.

The conference report and statement follow.

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 15)

to amend the act entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes,' approved May 22, 1920, and acts in amendment thereof," approved July 3, 1926, as amended, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with the following amendments:

1. In section 1, on page 1, in the last line of the engrossed copy of the amendment after the word "clerks," insert the following: "employees of the Indian Service at large, excepting clerks."

2. In section 1, on page 2, in line 3, after the words "navy yards," strike out the comma and insert "including leading men and quartermen but excluding master mechanics and foremen."

3. In section 2, on page 4, in line 21, after the word "years," strike out the period, insert a comma, and the following: "except that where the head of the department or establishment certifies, and the Civil Service Commission agrees, that by reason of expert knowledge and special qualifications the continuance of the employee would be advantageous to the public service, further extensions of two years may be granted."

4. In section 3, on page 6, in line 23, after the figures "1924," strike out the comma and insert "and amendments thereof."

5. In section 4, on page 9, in line 9, after the word "exceed," insert "three-fourths of."

6. In section 4, on page 9, in line 14, after the word "hereof," insert the following: "together with interest at 4 per cent per annum compounded on June 30 of each year."

7. In section 5, on page 10, in line 21, after the word "offices," insert a comma and the following: "or the legislative branch."

8. In section 5, on page 11, in line 13, after the word "excluded," insert the following: "except such leaves of absence granted employees while receiving benefits under the United States employees' compensation act."

9. In section 6, on page 12, in line 14, after the word "thereafter," strike out the period, insert a colon, and add the following: "Provided, That any employee who heretofore has failed to file an application for retirement within six months after separation from the service may file such application within three months after the effective date of this act."

10. In section 6, on page 14, in line 1, after the word "hereof," insert the following: "together with interest at 4 per cent per annum compounded on June 30 of each year."

11. In section 9, on page 18, in line 4, after the word "service," insert the following: "All employees who may hereafter be brought within the purview of this act may elect to make such deposits in installments during the continuance of their service in such amounts and under such conditions as may be determined in each instance by the Commissioner of Pensions."

12. In section 12, on page 20, in line 14, after the word "the" where it occurs the first time, strike out "Secretary of the Interior, after consultation with the heads of the executive departments and with the approval of the President," and insert in lieu thereof "Civil Service Commission."

13. In section 12, on page 20, in line 21, after the word "credited," strike out "together with interest at 4 per cent per annum compounded on June 30 of each year."

14. In section 12, on page 20, in line 23, after the word "employee," strike out the semicolon, insert a comma, and the following: "To be maintained by the department or office by which he is employed."

15. In section 12, on page 21, in line 4, after the word "credited," strike out the comma and the remainder of the paragraph and insert in lieu thereof "to such individual account."

16. In section 12, on page 21, in line 12, after the word "employee," strike out the colon and insert "together with interest at 4 per cent per annum compounded on June 30 of each year."

17. In section 12, on pages 21 and 22, strike out the paragraph designated (c) and in the following paragraphs strike out the letters (d), (e), (f), and (g), and insert in lieu thereof the letters (c), (d), (e), and (f), respectively.

18. In section 19, on page 27, strike out the last line and insert in lieu thereof "July, 1930."

And agree to the same.

FREDERICK R. LEHLBACH,
ADDISON T. SMITH,

Managers on the part of the House.

PORTER H. DALE,
JAMES COUZENS,

KENNETH McKELLAR (with statement),
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 15) to amend the act entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes,' approved May 22, 1920, and acts in amendment thereof," approved July 3, 1926, as amended, submit the following written statement explaining the effect of the action agreed on by the conference committee and submitted in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment to S. 15 struck out all after the enacting clause and inserted the text of the new bill. The Senate receded from its disagreement to this amendment and agreed to the same with 17 amendments, in which amendments to the House amendment the House conferees concur.

1. Includes among the class of employees automatically retiring at the age of 65 years employees of the Indian Service at large, excepting clerks.

2. Clarifies the provision for the automatic retirement of mechanics and laborers in navy yards by including leading men and quartermen, but excluding master mechanics and foremen, leaving the latter in the group retiring automatically at the age of 65 years.

3. Excepts from the provision that after August 20, 1930, no employee shall be continued in the civil service of the United States beyond the age of retirement for more than four years such employees in whose cases the head of the department or establishment certifies and the Civil Service Commission agrees, that by reason of expert knowledge and special qualifications the continuance of the employee would be advantageous to the public service.

4. To the provision excluding from the civil service retirement system persons within the Foreign Service as defined in the act of May 24, 1924, it adds persons within the Foreign Service as defined in amendments to such act.

5. The provision that no basic annuity shall exceed the compensation in active service is amended so that such annuity shall not exceed three-fourths of the compensation.

7. In computing the length of service upon which the retirement annuity is based periods of prior service in the unclassified civil service of the departments and establishments of the Government and in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard of the United States are included. This amendment also includes prior service in the legislative branch of the Government.

8. In computing the length of service upon which the retirement annuity is based so much of any leaves of absence as may exceed six months in the aggregate in any calendar year are excluded. This amendment makes this exclusion not applicable to leaves of absence granted employees while receiving benefits under the United States employees' compensation act.

9. Persons entitled to disability retirement are required to make application therefor within six months after the applicant's separation from the service. This amendment permits such employees who have heretofore failed to make such application within six months to do so within three months of the effective date of this act.

11. Persons not before within the provisions of the retirement act and who subsequently come thereunder are required to make a deposit of a sum equal to such contributions as they would have made had they been under the act during their prior service if they wish such period to count in computing their length of service as the basis for an annuity. This amendment permits such deposits to be made in installments in such amounts and under such conditions as may be determined in each instance by the Commissioner of Pensions.

6, 10, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, and 17. The effect of these amendments is to provide that the accounts of the moneys to the individual credit of the employees and their accumulations be kept in the department or office in which they are employed instead of in a central office.

18. Makes the effective date of the act July 1, 1930, instead of the 1st day of the second month next after its approval.

FREDERICK R. LEHLBACH,
ADDISON T. SMITH,

Managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey asks unanimous consent that a statement signed by one of the managers on the part of the Senate be printed immediately following the statement of the managers on the part of the House. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SEPARATE VIEWS OF SENATOR M'KELLAR

The majority of the conference committee has seen fit to report the Lehlbach bill. I am signing the report with reservations.

1. Under the terms of this bill carrying out a so-called tontine insurance plan, \$12 a year, \$1 a month, is taken out of the salary of each employee without compensation. I do not think the employees ought to be assessed with this dollar a month, but the Government ought to bear this proportion. Three and a half per cent is enough for the employees to pay. We started out on the absolute half-and-half plan, and we should uphold it. The claim is made that the dollar a month is a small amount, and so it is from each employee, but taking all the employees together it amounts to about \$5,100,000 per year.

2. The Lehlbach bill is more of an insurance bill than a retirement bill. The Dale bill is purely a retirement bill based on all of our previous retirement legislation. In the conference I moved to strike out the dollar-a-month provision, but the motion received only the vote of Mr. JEFFERS and myself. A majority of the conferees of both houses voted for the Lehlbach insurance plan and it carried.

3. I think it very unwise to depart from the now long-established plan of retiring Government employees under a retirement bill that has worked well and put them on an insurance basis. I know some of the representatives of the employees favored the change, and they may be right, but I believe it is not to the best interests of the great body of the employees.

4. There are groups of the employees of the Government now outside of the civil service who, under the terms of the Lehlbach bills, are required to pay all that they would have paid in during the last 10 years if they had been in the retirement plan. It was no fault of these clerks that they were not in the retirement system, and I think it is not fair to charge them with what they would have paid in order for them to receive the benefits of the system. In 1920 when we began this retirement system we did not require those clerks who were immediately retired to pay in anything to receive its benefits, and I do not believe we should treat the groups left out differently from what we treated those groups that originally came in. It was no fault of these groups that they were not included in the system then, and I do not think they should be charged this sum now in order to get the benefits of the system. Such charge, I am informed, will amount to about \$750 for each employee. I first offered an amendment to let them come in free, as did the original employees in 1920, but this was voted down by a majority of both Senate and House conferees. I then offered an amendment which provided that these groups can pay in installments, and this was adopted. Of course, this is better than the original bill, but I do not think these groups should be charged at all, and certainly they should not be charged the full amount of what they would have paid in if they had been members of the system during the last 10 years. Of course, the amendment will help some, because I take it many clerks not now in the system would be absolutely excluded if they had to pay cash the average sum of \$750 to get into the system.

5. The system of separate accounting set up in the Lehlbach bill would have cost the Government \$250,000 per year. This was eliminated by the three Senate conferees.

6. A provision in the Lehlbach bill gives a number of employees a retirement pay sometimes equal to what they received as salaries while working for the Government. I moved to strike this out and insert three-fourths pay, and this was done.

KENNETH M'KELLAR.

ADDRESS OF HON. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix an address recently delivered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing an address delivered by his colleague [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following address of Hon. RICHARD B. WIGGLESWORTH, of Massachusetts, at the exercises commemorating the three hundredth anniversary of the founding of the Massachusetts Bay Colony at Malden, Mass., May 13, 1930:

THE FOUNDING OF THE MASSACHUSETTS BAY COLONY

The event which we commemorate this evening and which is to be marked by appropriate ceremony in many of our cities and towns during the summer is one the importance of which can not be over-emphasized. It has meant much to Massachusetts, much to America, much to the world as a whole. History has yet to record the far-reaching effects of its influence.

It was the granting of the charter of the Massachusetts Bay Colony to a group of devout and courageous pioneers in 1629 which was destined to assure the development of this great Commonwealth of ours and the sturdy section of the country known as New England. It was

in a large measure upon the solid foundation laid in New England that the world was to see the erection of the American Nation offering unparalleled opportunity to the individual, enjoying unparalleled opportunity for contributing to the welfare of mankind.

The Puritans who came to our shores with this colony were a remarkable group of people. Macaulay has characterized them as "the most remarkable body of men perhaps which the world has ever produced." You may recall his tribute to them in his essay on Milton in part, as follows: "Those," he said, "who roused the people to resistance through a long series of eventful years; who formed out of the most unpromising material the finest army that Europe had ever seen; who trampled down king, church, and aristocracy; who in the short intervals of domestic sedition and rebellion made the name of England terrible to every nation on the face of the earth were no vulgar fanatics. They were men whose minds had derived a peculiar character from the daily contemplation of superior beings and eternal interests. Not content with acknowledging in general terms an overruling Providence, they habitually ascribed every event to the will of the Great Being for whose power nothing was too vast, for whose inspection nothing was too minute; to know Him, to serve Him, to enjoy Him was with them the great end of existence. Hence originated their contempt for terrestrial distinctions. They brought to civil and military affairs a coolness of judgment and an immutability of purpose which some writers have thought inconsistent with their religious zeal, but which were, in fact, the necessary effects of it. The intensity of their feelings on one subject made them tranquil on every other. They went through the world crushing and trampling down oppressors—insensible to fatigue, to pleasure, and to pain—not to be pierced by any weapon, not to be withstood by any barrier."

These men were content to leave their native land, their friends and relatives, the comforts of their homes, and to face the perils of the ocean and the hardships of a new world that they might find liberty of conscience. It is indeed fitting that we should pay our tribute at this time to the spirit of self-sacrifice and indomitable purpose which led to the ultimate triumph of the work to which they dedicated their lives.

Our forefathers knew thoroughly the principles and practices of government. Under the wide powers assumed under the Massachusetts Bay Colony charter there emerged for the first time in this country the outline of representative government as we know it in America to-day.

They brought with them also the spirit and tradition of English culture with a keen desire to plant here the fullest possible educational facilities. As one of them expressed it: "After God had carried us safe to New England and we builded our houses, provided necessities for our livelihood, reared convenient places for God's worship, and settled the civil government, one of the next things we longed for and looked after was to advance learning and perpetuate it to posterity." This desire for education which has continued to be a Massachusetts tradition to this day was reflected in the establishment of Harvard College only seven years after the founding of the colony. It was further evidenced by one of the most striking contributions made to the life of the Nation, namely, the founding of the first public school in America. It was these steps which were to lead the way in Massachusetts to free public schools, free high schools, free textbooks, and to outstanding schools and colleges for the education both of men and of women.

Those whom we honor brought with them also a sense of the glory of work. Idleness was regarded as a sin. Everyone, regardless of financial condition, was expected to work for the common welfare. Confronted by an unpromising soil and a severe climate, the energies of the colony were devoted, in large measure, to maritime and industrial pursuits. Shipbuilding, perhaps the first real industry, developed to afford the ships needed by the fishermen and for trade and commerce. Shipbuilding plants grew up in many communities, laying the foundation for a policy which at one time was to produce perhaps the greatest merchant marine in the world bearing the Stars and Stripes to every harbor of importance on earth. Other industries followed in turn leading from humble beginnings to the great industrial state which is ours to-day.

It was the ideals, fortitude, and faith in the future with which our forefathers were imbued which made possible the sacrifice of self for the sake of freedom of conscience, the triumph over hardships of every kind in the New World, and the ultimate contribution to State and Nation. It was these virtues also, inspiring millions coming to America at a later date, which served to carry us through the crises of the past and to weld us into the Nation which we are to-day. Let us hold fast to these qualities in meeting such problems as may confront us in the future.

We have our problems to-day. They can not be minimized. They must be solved. I am confident that they will be solved. Personally, it is helpful to me in this connection to keep in mind the tremendous progress which the world has made in the decade which has just closed. I shall not impose upon you by undue detail. Suffice it to point out that when the decade opened the world was confronted by economic problems of unprecedented magnitude.

The Great War, with its toll of over 10,000,000 killed and over 20,000,000 wounded or impaired in health, costing, according to competent authority, over \$300,000,000,000, had left in its wake famine, disease, and financial and economic chaos presenting a task of reconstruction without parallel in history. Generally speaking, to use the phraseology of a distinguished American statesman, "Industry and production were stagnant, trade was lifeless, and unemployment existed on a hitherto unheard-of scale. The budgets of the principal nations of the world were unbalanced, unsecured currencies fluctuated widely, creating almost insoluble problems in price and exchange; while a huge volume of intergovernmental debts remaining unsettled and unfunded, and a reparation bill of staggering proportions constituted almost impassable barriers to the restoration of credit and budgetary, currency, and exchange stability." No words can describe the human suffering, the bitterness, the hatreds resulting from these conditions.

To-day the world affords a striking contrast. Generally speaking, China and Russia excepted, order has been restored and the forces of production and industry are again on the march. Trade has increased, unemployment has diminished, national budgets have been balanced, currencies have been stabilized on a gold basis, intergovernmental debts have been funded, and a plan has been presented which it is devoutly to be hoped will prove to be a final solution of the separation question.

America has played its part in this world reconstruction. It has met and solved problems of the greatest difficulty at home. It has been able also to contribute to the solution of those problems which have confronted the nations overseas. Its record during the past 10 years, relatively speaking, has been almost as striking as that of the world as a whole. This record has no doubt been due to a combination of various factors—a combination of resource, industry, leadership, sound administration, and improved international understanding. Such a combination augurs well for the future. Let us not forget the record of these years. Even if circumstances at home or elsewhere are temporarily adverse, it seems to me impossible to consider the results achieved during this period in America and in the world as a whole without looking forward to the years to come with assurance and confidence.

We commemorate to-day the ideals, the courage, and the faith of our forefathers. In so doing let us not forget the opportunity—the responsibility—which they have intrusted to us as American citizens and as a Nation. No nation in the world to-day offers a greater opportunity to its individual citizen; no nation in the world enjoys a greater opportunity for contributing to the welfare of mankind. The use which we make of the opportunity and the power which is ours will largely determine the position which America holds in the pages of history. Let us go forward with this realization in mind, true to our heritage, "keenly alive," as Theodore Roosevelt expressed it, "to the responsibility implied in the very name 'American,' proud beyond measure of the glorious privilege of bearing it."

LIVING QUARTERS FOR CIVILIAN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE GOVERNMENT STATIONED IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs I call up the bill (H. R. 11371) to provide living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light, for civilian officers and employees of the Government stationed in foreign countries.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania calls up a bill which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar, and therefore the House automatically resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 11371, with Mr. MICHENER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 11371, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That under such regulations as the heads of the respective departments concerned may prescribe and the President approve, civilian officers and employees of the Government having permanent station in a foreign country may be furnished, without cost to them, living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light, in Government-owned or rented buildings and, where such quarters are not available, may be granted an allowance for living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light, notwithstanding the provisions of section 1765 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 70): *Provided*, That said rented quarters or allowances in lieu thereof may be furnished only within

the limits of such appropriations as may be made therefor, which appropriations are hereby authorized: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this act shall apply only to those civilian officers and employees who are citizens of the United States.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for one hour.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON].

Mr. EATON of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, this is a very important bill and I hope it will receive the kindly attention and consideration of the committee and the House.

This bill comes from the Foreign Affairs Committee with a unanimous vote. It has the strong recommendation of the Budget Bureau, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Labor, and of the Tariff Commission.

Its purpose is threefold. First, to equalize conditions now obtaining among our employees in foreign countries, which are not equal and ought to be. We have and have had in the Department of State certain housing facilities for the representatives of our Department of State abroad. We have voted in this House this year \$200,000 for the purpose of properly housing and caring for representatives of the Department of Commerce abroad. This bill attempts to put all departments of our Government with foreign representatives on an equal basis, so that all of our representatives abroad may be comfortably equipped to discharge their obligations to the country they represent.

In the second place, gentlemen, we want this bill to go through because it approaches a parity between ourselves and other great nations. It may be surprising to some of you gentlemen to know the difference between the way we equip our foreign representatives, in salaries and in housing, and the way in which other nations equip their representatives.

We have an ambassador in London, a distinguished statesman, who for four years presided as Vice President of the United States over the Senate. He has a house which, I believe he admits is very expensive, and he has a salary of \$17,500 a year.

Great Britain, the next great nation in the economic world, and our chief competitor in the markets of the world, has in Washington a representative who will have this summer as his official home the finest embassy building in this city, furnished him by his Government and completely equipped and carried on, and he will have \$75,000 a year in salary and allowances to take care of his important duties in this great Capital.

We do business with the great Argentine Republic. The British Government has a representative there who receives \$30,000 a year and a fine house. Our representative has \$17,500 a year, and until we get a little farther along he will have no house and will have to pay his own way, as he always has done.

Great Britain has a representative in Japan. He has a house worthy of the representative of Great Britain, and \$31,000 a year in salaries and allowances. Our man has no house and \$17,500 a year.

In the Argentine Republic Great Britain pays its consul general twice as much as we pay ours and houses him besides. They pay their next in authority twice as much as we pay our next in authority and house him besides. And this is supposed to be the greatest and richest country in the world, with vital and far-reaching relationships with every nation.

Now, gentlemen, I listened with delight to the distinguished and brilliant gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] smiting hip and thigh as only he can the accursed dogma of provincialism, and I rejoice to know that he is going to join us now in eliminating forever provincialism in our conception of how to support our foreign representatives abroad.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition for one hour in opposition to this bill. [Laughter.]

Mr. EATON of New Jersey. Well, one hour would be just as good as two, because I think it would be in vain.

I was greatly interested in the young gentleman from Florida, distressed over unemployment in this country, which he hitched up with the bill from the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House which has just been triumphantly passed.

Gentlemen, the time is here when we American people and the Government of the United States have got to wake up and face the fact that we are living in this identical world at this particular time and that we have certain responsibilities and opportunities and relationships which we can no longer dodge behind the screen of provincialism and narrowness or nigardiness in undertaking to discharge our obligations. [Applause.]

Mr. O'CONNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNELL. In other words, we are going along in line with the appropriations we made some years ago for new embassies abroad in order to make the United States equal to any other nation in its housing situation.

Mr. EATON of New Jersey. Exactly.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Carrying that doctrine to its logical conclusion, how about the protective tariff?

Mr. EATON of New Jersey. The protective tariff does not come under the jurisdiction of the Foreign Affairs Committee and I will wrestle with the gentleman in private on that subject, because I think in regard to his own State he is sound, like all the rest of us. [Laughter.]

Gentlemen, we have a national income of around \$90,000,000,000. In spite of the depressing picture which was painted for us this morning by that brilliant young orator from Florida, the fact is that our economic worst at this moment is better than the economic best of any other country in the world or any other country that the world ever saw.

This is the fact that we confront. We have unemployment and I regret it with all my heart and have spent the best years of my life grappling with the question of unemployment. But we can not solve the problem of unemployment by failing to properly care for our sons and daughters who represent us abroad.

We have a foreign trade now, in and out, of around \$9,000,000,000. It is a fact that we have an excess productive capacity, both in agriculture and industry, organized by science, and management and machinery and power from the wicked Power Trust that gives us 25 per cent more commodities than we can consume, or have consumed, at home; and the hope of continued prosperity in this country lies in the absorption of this excess production in our agriculture and industry by the other nations of the world. Who are going to get that for us? Our representatives abroad. We are sending them out to bring home the bacon and we want them to represent this country properly and to have a decent place to live in and a place where they can meet foreign people on an equal basis and worthily represent their country.

One of the central baffling problems which we are facing today is how to merchandise profitably abroad in the foreign markets our vast excess production. If we put the output of our agriculture and industry at \$40,000,000,000, 25 per cent of that is \$10,000,000,000. If you add \$10,000,000,000 of consumption of our production to what we now have, you solve the problem of unemployment in this country, and if we had the foreign trade that Canada has per capita, we would have a foreign trade of between thirty and forty billion dollars. You will not get this by staying at home and fulminating against the foreigner. You have got to go out into other countries, go out with an open hand and an open mind and an open heart, in a manner that is worthy of your country, and live abroad as Americans ought to live, and not live as the distinguished statesman from New York, who was forced to live in one room when he was an American diplomat somewhere over in southern Europe. [Applause.]

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask recognition in opposition to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for one hour.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAGUARDIA].

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, Lieut. Al Williams, who is the greatest aerial acrobat we have, has lost his record to the gentleman from New Jersey, Doctor EATON. I have seen him fly airplanes upside down and loop the loop, nose dive and spin, but I have never seen anyone turn a somersault so quickly as the gentleman from New Jersey did a moment ago.

Mr. EATON of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Let me finish my sentence. Here he comes and appeals for a good, strong American Diplomatic Service. Here he comes and says that the future of American industry and commerce depends on foreign trade and information that we can get from our American representatives in the Foreign Service. Only a few moments ago he admitted, together with the rest of the committee, that we could not get American citizens to get this information, but we must have foreign subjects in the Consular and in the Diplomatic Service because our men do not know the language of the country, and now he speaks for the American citizen in the service.

Mr. EATON of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I yield.

Mr. EATON of New Jersey. The question that arises in my mind is whether the little clerks and stenographers are the ones that get this entire information.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. My amendment would not disturb the little French stenographer.

Mr. EATON of New Jersey. I do not have a French stenographer. [Laughter.]

Mr. LAGUARDIA. My amendment would not have disturbed the little lackey who brings the cheap politicians around the town when they visit European cities. My amendment would not have disturbed the janitor or the cleaner or the charwoman, my amendment would have given preference to American citizens.

I say now, from my own actual experience as a Member of this House, that New York boys who graduate from our colleges in New York City are prejudiced against by the State Department for positions in the Consular and Diplomatic Service.

Mr. EATON of New Jersey. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. EATON of New Jersey. Would it assuage the gentleman's grief from the defeat of his amendment in the preceding bill—could we do anything toward that?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. You could adopt my amendment if it was possible in a parliamentary way, but that is all over now. It is too late.

Mr. EATON of New Jersey. We have got by that; we have to honor the dead. [Laughter.] Could we induce you now—

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I served in a consulate where we had foreign clerks and we found that information of the consular business was being peddled by some of these clerks from our office. We had an experience in our Consular Service recently since we passed the quota law, where foreign clerks have been discovered taking graft from immigrants—we have been through all that. I do not see how it is possible for a man to vote against giving preference to American citizens in the American Foreign Service, especially when Americans are seeking to enter the Diplomatic Service.

These American boys are taking courses in American colleges and applying for positions and they pass the written test and then go up to the oral test, and that is where they get them. Certain classes of our boys from New York City will not be accepted by the Department of State. They seemingly prefer subjects of foreign countries. That is the situation, and the gentleman from New Jersey should know it.

We have in New York brilliant boys who pass the written test and then go up for the oral test, and that is the end of their eligibility. I do not know whether you are going to provide unlimited quarters—

Mr. EATON of New Jersey. They have to be American citizens.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. How about that provincialism the committee members were talking about a few moments ago?

Mr. O'CONNELL. Their homes are there.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I agree with that, and now it is the committee that makes a discrimination.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOWARD. I am distressed when the rules of the House are broken. The gentleman from New York and the gentleman from New Jersey both know the rules of the House, and yet they persist in employing the first person in addressing each other.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. I used the third person.

Mr. HOWARD. Oh, no; I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York will proceed in order.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But the gentleman from New York was in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York will proceed in order.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. But I take exception to the Chairman's ruling. The gentleman from New York was in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has not ruled. He simply advises the gentleman to proceed in order.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. GREEN. It occurs to me that if the officers in charge of these foreign offices would exercise their authority of office, even under the law on which we were recently overridden, they could still employ our citizens, but they are not doing it.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. The positions which are desirable ought to be filled by young men from home, and the young men who are entitled to promotion I believe ought to be appointed from home. The consul general has limited powers to employ ste-

nographers, messengers, and the like. There is no objection to that, of course, and while some of the great diplomats on the committee sought to misconstrue my amendment and construe it as if it would hamper the consul in making those appointments in junior places where there is no promotion, there was nothing in the amendment to justify such a construction.

Mr. GREEN. The gentleman's amendment would have assisted them to eventually have good, strong American boys and girls in the employ of the Government. I believe a thousand such could be recruited in my own district for \$1,000 a year for the experience abroad and the training that they would get, and they can speak more languages than one.

Mr. ARENTZ. If the gentleman from Florida is correct, then why the language in the bill just passed that promotion shall be made to the senior grades from only those who are citizens from the United States? That does not indicate that they come from the United States, but it means the promotions are made from the junior grade to the senior grade.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. My amendment simply broadens that.

Mr. ARENTZ. But both gentlemen said that there were not American citizens employed in the junior grade.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Nobody said anything of the kind. While the gentleman was not on the floor, and while the bill was under discussion, the information was given that there were 1,317 clerks in our service who are not citizens of the United States—just 1,000 too many.

Mr. GREEN. And each of those places could have been filled by citizens of this country.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. I would not say all, but at least a thousand of them.

Mr. GREEN. When we beg for positions we can not get them. I have three young attorneys from my home district begging for any position they could get, one of them an expert stenographer. He wanted to go into the Foreign Service. He would have gone for \$100 a month.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Were they Democrats or Republicans?

Mr. GREEN. They were Democrats.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Of course, they could not get in.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. But there are other discriminations besides politics.

Mr. GREEN. That is true, but we can not get them in.

Mr. ABERNETHY. The gentleman did not expect to get any Democrats in, did he?

Mr. GREEN. I certainly did not.

Mr. LOZIER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Yes.

Mr. LOZIER. Is it not a fact that for 30 or 40 years it has been impossible for any poor man, a man of ordinary means, to obtain an appointment as an ambassador or minister to a foreign country from this country because of the small salary paid? And that has resulted in what undeniably is a national scandal. For 30 years only men with long pocketbooks have been able to fill these places.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Yes; but now we are not dealing with those positions in either of these bills. We are dealing with clerks who having the proper educational requirements and necessary ability might by promotion reach these high places. It is that class I sought to help by removing clerks who are not citizens of the United States.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BEEDY].

Mr. BEEDY. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I did not intend to speak at this time. In fact, I am frank to say that I did not know this particular bill was to be presented for our consideration here this afternoon. From my observations of our embassies and consulates abroad and from my own personal knowledge of some of the situations which exist in these consulates and embassies abroad, which to my mind are exceedingly to be regretted and are a reflection upon this Nation of ours, I felt I should rise to congratulate the Foreign Affairs Committee and the author of this bill for bringing it upon this floor. I know of situations involving young men of the finest type, who, having had the ambition to serve their country, have gotten into the service, enjoy the work, and dislike very much, having started the furrow, to leave it uncompleted. So they have kept on and at length have married. Many are living abroad in one room, buying part of their food ready prepared, living from hand to mouth, and are utterly unable to live in the manner in which we ought to enable them to live if we expect them to continue in our service. If this bill should become a law, I think it would do as much toward improving the morale of our Foreign Service as any one measure that we could pass. The suggestion made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LOZIER] a moment ago is well founded and it is a reflection which has always been made upon our Foreign Service. It is

repeatedly stated that only a rich man can remain in the service.

Only well-to-do men, men of independent income, can go into our service and live abroad and entertain as we would expect them to entertain the citizens of those countries with whom they come in contact. That is a situation very much to be regretted.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. BEEDY. Yes.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. The gentleman has noticed that this bill is not confined to employees of the State Department.

Mr. BEEDY. It has to do with civilian employees in the Foreign Service.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. It includes employees in the Department of Agriculture, in the Treasury Department, in the Department of Commerce, in the Department of Labor, and other agencies of the Government.

Mr. BEEDY. All those men are sent abroad to deal with our problems in foreign countries, commercial and otherwise, and in so doing they are obliged to meet with a substantial type of people. They not only meet people from foreign countries, but they meet our own people, and it is embarrassing for them not to be able to receive foreigners and American citizens in a manner that comports with the standing of this country.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. And the committee took that view, and it is shared by all the departments of the Government. The idea is to give fair, not extravagant allowances, so as to put these people on a status that will correspond with civilian employees of the Army and Navy.

Mr. BEEDY. I think it is a sane and commendable purpose, and I do not think it is necessary for me to urge its desirability upon this House, intelligent as I know it to be; I wish merely to express my congratulations to the committee.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEEDY. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNELL. I will say to the gentleman that we have had exhaustive hearings on the bill, and it is commended by everybody who has had the necessity of going abroad. We ought to be as good as any other nation.

Mr. BEEDY. Yes; I agree with the gentleman; and I can not conceive that any intelligent person who knows the facts would raise his voice against this proposed legislation.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. It is in accordance with what other countries are doing now.

Mr. BEEDY. I do not know as to that, but I believe that if only one or two other nations provide living accommodations for their representatives abroad, surely the United States ought to do it. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD].

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to enlighten the members of the Committee of the Whole, and particularly the members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and dispel from their minds the idea that other governments are pursuing a similar policy. I wish to direct the attention of the committee to the report, page 3, which negatives the idea enunciated by the brilliant and distinguished and erudite gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE] and the versatile and accomplished gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNELL] that other countries are pursuing the same policy of providing allowances for fuel, light, and rental accommodations. If I am in error I will yield to either or both of those distinguished gentlemen for correction.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I would say at this time that it is a strange thing that while we do not make this provision for the particular people that we are talking about, we do make that provision for the employees of the Army and Navy.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is an accepted alibi just enunciated by the distinguished advocate from Virginia. He seems to try to carry out the illusion that our Government is guilty of a faux pas in not extending a condition arising directly from the peculiar conditions surrounding Army and Navy service. Generally speaking, in the military branch of the Government, and the same is true of the naval branch, when the Government does not provide quarters for officers of the Army or Navy at a post or yard, we provide commutation of quarters in lieu; and carrying out that policy with respect to military and naval attachés assigned for duty in foreign countries, they are allowed commutation of quarters.

But as a general policy foreign governments do not accord to their employees, when assigned to clerical service in foreign posts, any allowance for quarters, light, or heat. But our Government in the Foreign Service of the Department of State and also of the Department of Commerce where living conditions are of such an exceptional character that the present salary does not

compensate for the living conditions that prevail generally, does make compensating allowances. In the State Department appropriation bill and in the Commerce Department appropriation bill several hundred thousand dollars are provided as a fund for the department heads to bring about an equalization of salaries in accordance with the exceptional living conditions wherever they prevail.

What does this bill do? We have just passed through the House almost unanimously a bill providing for proper classification and grading of salaries to clerks in the Foreign Service. That is the bill reported by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM].

I was in Congress when the distinguished predecessor and husband of the worthy gentlewoman from Massachusetts, the late Hon. John Jacob Rogers, brought before this House a bill to increase and equalize the salaries in our Consular Service. It was then shown that the salaries paid to our consuls were inadequate. The salaries were then placed on a higher level, on the theory that those officials should pay for their own living quarters. It was so liberal in its provisions that you might say there have not been any general or even minor withdrawals from the Consular Service since those increases became operative during the administration of the distinguished former Secretary of State, Charles Evans Hughes. Now, we have just passed through the House a bill providing for paying living salaries to those employed in the clerical positions in the Foreign Service.

What are you trying to do here? This is purely a salary-raising proposition. You raise the salaries of all consular officers, and even the clerical employees, and now you propose to make a further increase in salary, under the guise of an allowance for quarters. We are already providing for exigent conditions where the living expenses are abnormal. We appropriate funds amounting to hundreds of thousands of dollars where those exceptional living conditions pertain, and now you are providing in substance for further increase in their salaries.

I very strongly contend that it would be far better to provide for their living expenses in the way of salaries, rather than by making a special allotment for living expenses. It would be far better if that policy were established than that we recognize the idea that every employee of our Government, whether at home or abroad, should be provided with living quarters.

There is something to be said regarding the argument as to disparity of salaries of our head diplomatic officers per se. I recognize that in many instances a salary of \$17,500 is not commensurate with the station and responsibilities of some of the diplomatic corps, but I have some general idea that those salaries, in many instances, are remunerative, particularly in the small South American countries. I have in mind one or two instances where I know the minister regarded the salary as lucrative.

This bill is essentially a bill to raise salaries. We have increased the salaries of the officers in the Foreign Service under the Rogers bill so that there can be no complaint. There have been no resignations from the service by reason of inadequate salaries. We have just made provision for increasing the salaries of the clerical forces in the Foreign Service. Now it is attempted to add to that by providing this allowance for living quarters. Who is to determine the character of the allowance? Is it to be a flat rate or will there be different scales of living for the respective clerks according to the respective countries in which they are living? It is purely a question of salaries. It would be better to have this allowance included in the salary than to work out an anachronism, as I see it, by paying special allowances to officers and clerks for quarters, light, and heat.

I yield to my distinguished friend from Virginia.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. I would not interrupt except that the gentleman from Wisconsin never touches any subject which he does not adorn.

Mr. STAFFORD. I can not equal my friend from Virginia in the wonderful embellishments which he frequently bestows upon the speaker.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Foreign governments always make specific allowance or include in the salaries an amount that will cover expenses such as are dealt with in this bill. That is exactly what is done by the Army and Navy. The Army and Navy, under the law, do not add a specific amount to take care of these expenses, but they came before our committee, at least the representatives of the Navy, and told us that they include in the salaries of civilian employees abroad, something that will take care of these items that are being dealt with here.

While I am on my feet I would like to say further to my friend from Wisconsin that at the present time the Committee on Appropriations handles this subject to a large extent by making appropriations, and the point has been made that they

do that without any authority of organic law. The Assistant Secretary of State, in the hearings referring to that matter, said: "That was very fully considered in the Committee on Appropriations in both the House and the Senate. In fact, it has been discussed at great length in the Committee on Appropriations in the House for at least three years, and the committee is in full accord with the legislation you are proposing in this bill." That is this very legislation.

The chairman of the committee said: "I might interrupt to say that Mr. SHREVE spoke to me about this matter several times—in regard to having the proper authorization." Mr. SHREVE is chairman of the subcommittee on the State Department bill.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHREVE] is the chairman of the subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee having charge of the appropriations for the State Department, and he wishes the proper authorization so that the committee can base its action upon substantive law.

Mr. STAFFORD. Apparently I have not made myself clear to my friend from Virginia, that the allowance for rent and quarters to our military and naval attachés is predicated upon the rule established in this country, that when any military officer is stationed at a post where there are no quarters he is allowed commutation of quarters; and, naturally, when he goes abroad he carries that same principle with him. I dissent from that exposition of policy of the Government that in any instance we vote any allowance for commutation of quarters to any clerk to any naval or military attaché. The report of the committee on this bill shows that the average salary of the military and naval attachés are of such amount that they secure high-grade officials whose major purpose is to adorn, in a social way, our embassies abroad.

As far as providing authorization of law is concerned, if this bill is passed, I venture the prediction that there will be no cessation in the appropriations reported by the Committee on Appropriations for adjusting the difference in scale of living where the clerks are employed, and they are different from the general, normal conditions. That \$200,000 which is voted for the Commerce Department, and whatever is voted in the Foreign Service Department, \$150,000 or \$200,000, will continue. I do not think there will be any member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs who will dispute my statement. If anyone thinks I am in error when I say that since the passage of the Rogers bill there has been no general withdrawal from the service by reason of inadequacy of pay, I would appreciate it if the gentleman would so inform the House. I am under the impression that that bill took care effectively of the Consular Service, and it was predicated upon the idea that the consular officers were to pay for their own living quarters. We raised their salaries to what we considered the proper amount, based upon living conditions which followed the war. Now, by way of subterfuge, we are adding to those salaries by this allowance for quarters. That is all it is.

Mr. PALMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I yield.

Mr. PALMER. Has the gentleman made any estimate of what the cost will be to the Government to provide living quarters, to provide the employees with fuel and light? What is the total amount of additional cost?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will say in reply to my friend from Missouri that the amount will be limited to what the Committee on Appropriations votes, but from my acquaintance with conditions arising in the Committee on Appropriations, after some years of service on that committee, and as that committee is at present functioning, it is my belief that the heads of the departments will provide a scale commensurate with the American standard of living and request that they should have so much money.

The report does not show what it will cost to put this system into effect, but I make this prediction, that if you establish this policy you will find it is going to come home to plague you, so that you will be asked to provide not only living quarters for clerks abroad but living quarters for clerks at home.

As I view the practical legislative situation, I would prefer to vote to increase salaries and allow the clerks to provide their own quarters, according to their own ideas, rather than to have some department head prescribe a norm which will be the basis for what they determine are proper living quarters.

If you will recall what took place on the floor to-day in the consideration of the former bill, you can conceive that once you establish this policy you will find persons coming on the floor and saying, "There is nothing too good for an American citizen when he is employed by the United States of America in foreign climes. Give him the best and raise it to the limit."

Mr. SEGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. SEGER. The statement is made by the gentleman from Wisconsin that he would raise the salaries to be commensurate with the cost of living on the other side.

Mr. STAFFORD. No. We provide a lump-sum appropriation in the State Department appropriation bill and in the Department of Commerce appropriation bill. For each department the appropriation is \$200,000, and the department head is privileged to make an allowance and increase the salaries based on exceptional living conditions in foreign countries.

Mr. SEGER. Which would compare with living conditions in this country.

Mr. STAFFORD. Naturally. For instance, in some countries like South America and the Orient, the cost of living is very much higher and naturally there must be some arrangement made to take care of that condition. That is a workable proposition, but when you provide for quarters there must be a standard, and it is not a workable and practical proposition.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That under such regulations as the heads of the respective departments concerned may prescribe and the President approve, civilian officers and employees of the Government having permanent station in a foreign country may be furnished, without cost to them, living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light, in Government-owned or rented buildings, and where such quarters are not available may be granted an allowance for living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light, notwithstanding the provisions of section 1765 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 70): *Provided*, That said rented quarters or allowances in lieu thereof may be furnished only within the limits of such appropriations as may be made therefor, which appropriations are hereby authorized: *Provided further*, That the provisions of this act shall apply only to those civilian officers and employees who are citizens of the United States.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment. On page 2, line 2, after the word "light," strike out the balance of the line and all of line 3.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. LA GUARDIA: Page 2, line 2, after the word "light," strike out the balance of line 2 and all of line 3.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, may the Clerk read the words that are stricken out?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read the words to be stricken out.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Notwithstanding the provisions of section 1765 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 70).

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The statement has been made that this is a bill to increase salaries. On the contrary, this is a bill to equalize our own treatment of the men we employ in the foreign service. The Congress and the country have adopted the policy of providing quarters for our ambassadors and ministers, and in many of the countries of the world to which we send diplomatic representatives we already have buildings.

In some other countries we have not yet built or bought them. Why should we not equalize matters by giving the ambassadors and ministers in countries where we have no quarters the means to pay rent for buildings that they live in?

We passed some years ago a law providing for construction in Japan of buildings for diplomatic offices and residences for ambassadors and apartment houses for resident secretaries and American employees. In many other countries we have no such arrangement.

This bill is intended to equalize conditions among the people we employ to represent us in foreign countries.

Now, it is said that there will be no limit. In an estimate given on page 2 of the hearings furnished by the department the estimate of the State Department is \$726,000. The estimate of the Department of Commerce is \$200,000. These appropriations are for the current year and have already been made. If you will add together the items to which appropriations have not been made, you will find the total additional authorized in this bill is \$97,200, as against nearly a million dollars appropriated for like allowances for employees of departments already provided for. It is a bill to equalize conditions and not a bill to raise salaries.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEMPLE. I yield.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Let me add a word, that this resolution presupposes that before anything is done the President will make full regulations.

Mr. TEMPLE. Yes.

Mr. COLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEMPLE. I yield.

Mr. COLE. If the gentleman from New York is really sincere and wants the American employees in foreign countries, he should be in favor of this bill, because the present conditions militate against the employment of Americans in this service.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. I think that is the best point made this afternoon in this debate. I am glad to see that the committee is limiting it to American citizens, while they ridiculed my position in the other bill.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, the motion of the gentleman from New York is to strike out certain language. To that motion the usual pro forma amendment is probably not in order. I therefore ask to proceed for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Illinois is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in order to dissent from the view which has been expressed and approved by several members of the committee, that section 1765 of the Revised Statutes relates to legislative action. I do not think it does. Section 1765 of the Revised Statutes reads as follows:

No officer in any branch of the public service, or any other person whose salary, pay, or emoluments are fixed by law or regulations, shall receive any additional pay, extra allowance, or compensation in any form whatever, for the disbursement of public money, or for any other service or duty whatever, unless the same is authorized by law and the appropriation therefor states that it is for such additional pay, extra allowance, or compensation.

Clearly that is a limitation upon the executive and administrative authority, but can not be a limitation on the action of Congress itself. I think without this provision in the pending bill section 1765 would yet be nonoperative. If you apply the theory and principle of that section you will find they accord wholly with the provisions of this bill, because in the bill it is provided by authorization of law that certain emoluments and other benefits may be given to employees in addition to existing salaries, and these benefits may be furnished only "within the limits of such appropriations as may be made therefor."

So when it is said that striking out the provision would kill the bill, I dissent from that view. I will say, however, that inasmuch as the provision is now in the bill, and the motion is to strike it out, the action of striking it out might be serious, because it might then be held by the courts that Congress was unwilling to have this proposed legislation stand entirely upon its own footing. It is a well-known principle that subsequent legislation amends and modifies prior legislation, so I think that if we pass a law here under which we are giving additional compensation to certain employees, section 1765 of the Revised Statutes would not apply because this is subsequent legislation.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Yes.

Mr. DOWELL. It would have the same effect in repealing, so far as this act is concerned, if this part is eliminated, would it not?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I think it would, but I do not see the necessity for eliminating the provision. I think it a little inconsistent, perhaps, to put it in in the first place, but it is a well-known principle of construction that where a provision is eliminated by affirmative action, it might show an intent on the part of the legislative body to dissent from the original purpose of the text.

Mr. DOWELL. I can see where there would be no difference in the construction of the language left in the bill if this is eliminated, and it seems to me that the language of the bill clearly repeals any law that is in conflict with this in any way. I can see no change in the bill even with the amendment agreed to striking it out.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I agree with the gentleman's views, except for the fact that in the course of the debate it was said on one side that this would practically kill the legislation and that was practically conceded on the other side; I hold no such view. I do not think it will make any difference, as a matter of fact, whether this citation with reference to section 1765 of the Revised Statutes is in the bill, but it having been put in the bill, I think it wise to leave it as it is, for the reason stated.

Mr. DOWELL. I think the courts would follow the suggestion of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. I also think so. Having reached this situation, however, I think it would be unwise to adopt the amendment and strike the language out. It can do no harm to leave it in.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, I should like to add as the acting chairman of committee that I agree entirely with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM]. I do not believe it would kill the bill to strike that out, but for fear of the situation he speaks of, I should prefer to see it left in.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LA GUARDIA].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill with the recommendation that it do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MICHENER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 11371, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LA GUARDIA) there were—ayes 60, noes 1.

Mr. LA GUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote upon the ground that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will bring in absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 227, nays 32, not voting 168, as follows:

[Roll No. 46]

YEAS—227

Ackerman	Driver	Kendall, Pa.	Reid, Ill.
Adkins	Dyer	Kennedy	Robinson
Aldrich	Eaton, Colo.	Ketcham	Rogers
Allen	Eaton, N. J.	Kiefner	Romjue
Andresen	Elliott	Kopp	Rowbottom
Andrew	Englebright	Korell	Rutherford
Arentz	Eslick	LaGuardia	Sanders, N. Y.
Arnold	Esterly	Lambertson	Schafer, Wis.
Bacon	Evans, Calif.	Langley	Schneider
Baird	Evans, Mont.	Lankford, Va.	Sears
Beedy	Fish	Lea	Seger
Bland	Fisher	Leavitt	Selberling
Bloom	Fitzgerald	Lehbach	Selvig
Bohn	Fitzpatrick	Letts	Shaffer, Va.
Bolton	Fort	Linthicum	Shott, W. Va.
Bowman	French	Lozier	Simmons
Brand, Ga.	Fuller	Luce	Simms
Brand, Ohio	Gambrell	Ludlow	Sloan
Briggs	Garber, Okla.	McClintock, Ohio	Smith, W. Va.
Brigham	Garner	McCormack, Mass.	Snell
Buchanan	Garrett	McKeown	Snow
Burness	Gibson	McLaughlin	Speaks
Butler	Gifford	McLeod	Spearing
Byrns	Goodwin	McSwain	Sprout, Ill.
Campbell, Iowa	Granfield	Maas	Stalker
Canfield	Greenwood	Manlove	Stobbs
Carter, Calif.	Gregory	Mapes	Strong, Pa.
Chalmers	Hadley	Martin	Summers, Wash.
Chindblom	Hall, Ill.	Menges	Swanson
Christgau	Hall, Ind.	Michener	Swing
Clague	Haley	Miller	Taber
Clancy	Hancock	Milligan	Tarver
Clark, Md.	Hartley	Moore, Ky.	Taylor, Tenn.
Clark, N. C.	Hastings	Moore, Ohio	Temple
Cochran, Mo.	Hess	Moore, Va.	Thatcher
Cochran, Pa.	Hickey	Morgan	Thompson
Cole	Hill, Ala.	Nelson, Me.	Tilson
Colton	Hill, Wash.	Nelson, Mo.	Tinkham
Conner	Hogg	Newhall	Treadway
Cooper, Tenn.	Hooper	Norton	Underhill
Cooper, Wis.	Hope	O'Connell	Vinson, Ga.
Cornling	Hopkins	O'Connor, La.	Wainwright
Cox	Howard	O'Connor, N. Y.	Walker
Coxie	Hull, Morton D.	O'Connor, Okla.	Warren
Crall	Hull, Tenn.	Oldfield	Wason
Cramton	Irwin	Owen	Weich, Calif.
Cross	Johnson, Nebr.	Palmer	Whitley
Crosser	Johnson, Okla.	Palmisano	Whittington
Culkin	Johnson, S. Dak.	Parker	Wigglesworth
Dallinger	Johnson, Tex.	Perkins	Wilson
Darrow	Johnson, Wash.	Pittenger	Wolverton, N. J.
Davenport	Johnson, Mo.	Prall	Wolverton, W. Va.
Davis	Jonas, N. C.	Pratt, Ruth	Wood
Denison	Kading	Quin	Woodruff
Dickstein	Kahn	Ramsayer	Wurzbach
Douglass, Mass.	Kemp	Ramspeck	Zihlman
Drewry	Kendall, Ky.	Reed, N. Y.	

NAYS—32

Abernethy	Edwards	Hammer	Jones, Tex.
Almon	Fulmer	Hardy	Kincheloe
Box	Gasque	Hare	Lankford, Ga.
Christopherson	Glover	Huddleston	Larsen
Doxey	Green	Hull, Wis.	Morehead

Patman
Rainey, Henry T.
Rankin

Sanders, Tex.
Sandlin
Sinclair

Somers, N. Y.
Sprout, Kans.
Stafford

Summers, Tex.
Williams
Williamson

NOT VOTING—168

Allgood	De Priest	Johnson, Ill.	Pritchard
Aswell	DeRouen	Johnson, Ind.	Purnell
Auf der Heide	Dickinson	Kearns	Quayle
Ayres	Dominick	Kelly	Ragon
Bacharach	Doughton	Kerr	Ramey, Frank M.
Bachmann	Douglas, Ariz.	Kiess	Ransley
Bankhead	Doutrich	Kinzer	Rayburn
Barbour	Dowell	Knutson	Reece
Beck	Doyle	Kunz	Sabath
Beers	Drane	Kurtz	Short, Mo.
Bell	Dunbar	Kvale	Shreve
Black	Ellis	Lampert	Sirovich
Blackburn	Estep	Lanham	Smith, Idaho
Boylan	Fenn	Leech	Sparks
Britten	Finley	Lindsay	Stearns
Browne	Foss	McClintic, Okla.	Stedman
Browning	Frear	McCormick, Ill.	Stevenson
Brumm	Free	McDuffie	Stone
Brunner	Freeman	McFadden	Strong, Kans.
Buckbee	Garber, Va.	McMillan	Sullivan, N. Y.
Burdick	Gavagan	McReynolds	Sullivan, Pa.
Busby	Golder	Magrady	Swick
Cable	Goldsborough	Mansfield	Taylor, Colo.
Campbell, Pa.	Graham	Mead	Thurston
Cannon	Griffin	Merritt	Timberlake
Carley	Guyer	Michaelson	Tucker
Carter, Wyo.	Hale	Montague	Turpin
Cartwright	Hall, Miss.	Montet	Underwood
Celler	Hall, N. Dak.	Mooney	Vestal
Chase	Haugen	Mouser	Vincent, Mich.
Clarke, N. Y.	Hawley	Murphy	Watres
Collier	Hoch	Nelson, Wis.	Watson
Collins	Hoffman	Niedringhaus	Welsh, Pa.
Connolly	Holaday	Nolan	White
Cooke	Houston, Del.	Oliver, Ala.	Whitehead
Cooper, Ohio	Hudson	Oliver, N. Y.	Wingo
Craddock	Hudspeth	Parks	Wolfenden
Crisp	Hull, William E.	Patterson	Woodrum
Crowther	Igoe	Peavey	Wright
Cullen	James	Porter	Wyant
Curry	Jeffers	Pou	Yates
Dempsey	Jenkins	Pratt, Harcourt J. Yon	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Bacharach with Mr. Crisp.
Mr. Buckbee with Mr. Mansfield.
Mr. Michaelson with Mr. Oliver of New York.
Mr. Vestal with Mr. Woodrum.
Mr. Harcourt J. Pratt with Mr. Ayres.
Mr. Knutson with Mr. DeRouen.
Mr. Yates with Mr. Ragon.
Mr. Johnson of Indiana with Mr. Wright.
Mr. Hoch with Mr. Busby.
Mr. Foss with Mr. Arnold.
Mr. Dowell with Mr. Doughton.
Mr. Smith of Idaho with Mr. Douglas of Arizona.
Mr. Watres with Mr. McClintic of Oklahoma.
Mr. Hale with Mr. Parks.
Mr. Cable with Mr. McMillan.
Mr. Brown with Mr. Hall of Mississippi.
Mr. Kvale with Mr. Jeffers.
Mr. Hudson with Mr. Dominick.
Mr. Wolfenden with Mr. Wingo.
Mr. Haugen with Mr. Hudspeth.
Mr. Freeman with Mr. Mooney.
Mr. Britten with Mr. Allgood.
Mr. Jenkins with Mr. Collins.
Mrs. McCormick of Illinois with Mr. Sullivan of New York.
Mr. Burdick with Mr. Auf der Heide.
Mr. Clarke of New York with Mr. Stedman.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

On motion of Mr. TEMPLE, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

THE HAGUE CONFERENCE—CODIFICATION OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I call up House Joint Resolution 331 and ask that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Joint Resolution 331

Joint resolution relative to The Hague Conference on the Codification of International Law

Resolved, etc., That the Congress of the United States of America expresses its approval of the action of the United States delegation at The Hague Conference on the Codification of International Law in voting against the "convention on certain questions relating to the conflict of nationality laws."

Resolved further, That it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States of America that there should be absolute equality for both sexes in nationality, and that in the treaties, law, and practice of the United States relating to nationality there should be no distinction based on sex.

With a committee amendment as follows:

Page 1, line 5, after the word "conference," insert the figures "1930."

The SPEAKER. The bill is on the House Calendar. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has one hour.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, while a conference was being held in London for the purpose of limiting naval armaments, to which we sent as our delegates the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Navy, and several Senators, another conference was held at The Hague, in Holland, for the purpose of codifying international law, a very important conference, but one in which the American people took little interest because their attention was centered on the London Conference for Limitation of Naval Armaments.

We sent our delegates to The Hague Conference on the Codification of International Law, which began on March 13 and concluded on April 12, 1930. Mr. David Hunter Miller, editor of treaties in the State Department, was the chairman of the delegation. The other members were Mr. Green H. Hackworth, Solicitor of the Department of State; Mr. R. W. Flournoy, Jr., Assistant Solicitor, Department of State; Mr. Theodore G. Risley, Solicitor, Department of Labor; and Mrs. Ruth B. Shipley, Chief of the Passport Division in the Department of State. The following, Prof. James Brown Scott, president of the American Institute of International Law; Miss Alice Paul and Hon. JOHN L. CABLE, Representative in Congress from Ohio, who has sponsored in Congress the legislation for equality between men and women in nationality, appeared before the Committee on Foreign Affairs and specifically indorsed the pending resolution.

The purpose of the conference at The Hague was to recodify international law. That conference took up the question of nationality, and proposed to write into the proposed world code certain inequalities with reference to nationality in contravention to the well-understood principle of the American Government, as developed and formulated by the United States, that there should be no discrimination or distinctions based on sex in nationality.

In other words, the Old World wanted to continue their principles and their practices and write them into international law, which would be the world code for generations to come.

Our delegation, headed by Mr. Miller, opposed these inequalities throughout, but was voted down by a vote of 40 to 1 on the adoption of the convention. It seems to me to be a question of calling upon the New World to redress the wrongs of the Old. Our delegates stood up in that conference, in spite of overwhelming opposition, and opposed these inequalities based on sex and refused to support or sign the convention.

It is the purpose of this resolution to indorse the action of our delegates and to uphold the principle of equality in reference to nationality, and also to make clear the declared policy of the United States of America that there should be absolute equality to both sexes in nationality and that in the treaties and laws of the United States relating to nationality there should be no distinction based on sex.

Two different hearings were held before the Committee on Foreign Affairs. Leaders of various women's groups throughout the country appeared, and I am happy to say that they were unanimous, which is not always the case with women any more than with men on different important issues pending before the country, particularly such an important one as this; but all groups of women through their leaders approved this resolution as reported unanimously by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Representative CABLE, who is the leader for this kind of legislation in the House, appeared before the committee and indorsed the resolution most emphatically. Prof. James Brown Scott, who was head of the American Institute on International Law, appeared and spoke in favor of the resolution without any change or amendment.

The resolution comes to you with the unanimous report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs and of all groups of women, not only in the National Woman's Party but all the different groups of women throughout the country, backed by a unanimous report of the Committee on Foreign Affairs after careful consideration based on the open hearings before the committee.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD all the articles that were adopted in the convention on nationality laws. Our delegates approved some of the 17 articles and disapproved others, but the entire convention was disapproved by our delegates because it contained principles of inequality contrary to our laws in reference to nationality. Therefore I thought it would be well to put in the RECORD at this time all the articles contained in the convention. I am under the impression our delegates opposed most of the articles from 8 to 17.

CONVENTION ON CERTAIN QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE CONFLICT OF NATIONALITY LAWS

Names of the high contracting parties

Considering that it is of importance to settle by international agreement questions relating to the conflict of nationality laws;

Being convinced that it is in the general interest of the international community to secure that all its members should recognize that every person should have a nationality, and should have one nationality only;

Recognizing accordingly that the ideal toward which the efforts of humanity should be directed in this domain is the abolition of all cases both of statelessness and of double nationality;

Being of opinion that under the economic and social conditions which at present exist in the various countries it is not possible to reach immediately a uniform solution of all the above-mentioned problems;

Being desirous, nevertheless, as a first step toward this great achievement of settling in a first attempt at progressive codification those questions relating to the conflict of nationality laws on which it is possible at the present time to reach international agreement;

Have decided to conclude a convention, and have for this purpose appointed as their plenipotentiaries:

Designation of plenipotentiaries

Who, having deposited their full powers found in good and due form, have agreed as follows:

CHAPTER I.—GENERAL PRINCIPLES

Article 1

It is for each state to determine under its own law who are its nationals. This law shall be recognized by other states, in so far as it is consistent with international conventions, international custom, and the principles of law generally recognized with regard to nationality.

Article 2

Any question as to whether a person possesses the nationality of a particular state shall be determined in accordance with the law of that state.

Article 3

Subject to the provisions of the present convention, a person having two or more nationalities may be regarded as its national by each of the states whose nationality he possesses.

Article 4

A state may not afford diplomatic protection to one of its nationals against a state whose nationality such person also possesses.

Article 5

Within a third state a person having more than one nationality shall be treated as if he had only one. Without prejudice to the application of its law in matters of personal status and of any conventions in force, a third state shall, of the nationalities which any such person possesses, recognize exclusively in its territory either the nationality of the country in which he is habitually and principally resident or the nationality of the country with which in the circumstances he appears to be in fact most closely connected.

Article 6

Without prejudice to the liberty of a state to accord wider rights to renounce its nationality, a person possessing two nationalities acquired without any voluntary act on his part may renounce one of them with the authorization of the state whose nationality he desires to surrender.

This authorization may not be refused in the case of a person who has his habitual and principal residence abroad if the conditions laid down in the law of the State whose nationality he desires to surrender are satisfied.

CHAPTER II.—EXPATRIATION PERMITS

Article 7

In so far as the law of a state provides for the issue of an expatriation permit, such a permit shall not entail the loss of the nationality of the state which issues it, unless the person to whom it is issued possesses another nationality or unless and until he acquires another nationality.

An expatriation permit shall lapse if the holder does not acquire a new nationality within the period fixed by the state which has issued the permit. This provision shall not apply in the case of an individual who, at the time when he receives the expatriation permit, already possesses a nationality other than that of the state by which the permit is issued to him.

The state whose nationality is acquired by a person to whom an expatriation permit has been issued, shall notify such acquisition to the state which has issued the permit.

CHAPTER III.—NATIONALITY OF MARRIED WOMEN

Article 8

If the national law of the wife causes her to lose her nationality on marriage with a foreigner, this consequence shall be conditional on her acquiring the nationality of the husband.

Article 9

If the national law of the wife causes her to lose her nationality upon a change in the nationality of her husband occurring during marriage, this consequence shall be conditional on her acquiring her husband's new nationality.

Article 10

Naturalization of the husband during marriage shall not involve a change in the nationality of the wife except with her consent.

Article 11

The wife who, under the law of her country, lost her nationality on marriage shall not recover it after the dissolution of the marriage except on her own application and in accordance with the law of that country. If she does recover it, she shall lose the nationality which she acquired by reason of the marriage.

CHAPTER IV.—NATIONALITY OF CHILDREN

Article 12

Rules of law which confer nationality by reason of birth on the territory of a state shall not apply automatically to children born to persons enjoying diplomatic immunities in the country where the birth occurs.

The law of each state shall permit children of consuls de carrière, or of officials of foreign states charged with official missions by their governments, to become divested, by repudiation or otherwise, of the nationality of the state in which they were born in any case in which on birth they acquired dual nationality, provided that they retain the nationality of their parents.

Article 13

Naturalization of the parents shall confer on such of their children as, according to its law, are minors the nationality of the state by which the naturalization is granted. In such case the law of that state may specify the conditions governing the acquisition of its nationality by the minor children as a result of the naturalization of the parents.

In cases where minor children do not acquire the nationality of their parents as the result of the naturalization of the latter, they shall retain their existing nationality.

Article 14

A child whose parents are both unknown shall have the nationality of the country of birth. If the child's parentage is established, its nationality shall be determined by the rules applicable in cases where the parentage is known.

A founding is, until the contrary is proved, presumed to have been born on the territory of the state in which it was found.

Article 15

Where the nationality of a state is not acquired automatically by reason of birth on its territory, a child born on the territory of that State of parents having no nationality, or of unknown nationality, may obtain the nationality of the said state. The law of that state shall determine the conditions governing the acquisition of its nationality in such cases.

Article 16

If the law of the state whose nationality an illegitimate child possesses recognizes that that nationality may be lost as a consequence of a change in the civil status of the child (legitimation, recognition), such loss shall be conditional on the acquisition by the child of the nationality of another state under the law of that state governing the effect of the change in civil status upon nationality.

CHAPTER V.—ADOPTION

Article 17

If the law of a state recognizes that its nationality may be lost as the result of adoption, this loss shall be conditional upon the acquisition by the person adopted of the nationality of the person by whom he is adopted under the law of the state of which the latter is a national governing the effect of adoption upon nationality.

CHAPTER VI.—GENERAL AND FINAL PROVISIONS

Article 18

The high contracting parties agree to apply the principles and rules contained in the preceding articles in their relations with each other as from the date of the entry into force of the present convention.

The inclusion of the above-mentioned principles and rules in the convention shall in no way be deemed to prejudice the question whether they do or do not already form part of international law.

It is understood that, in so far as any point is not covered by any of the provisions of the preceding article, the existing principles and rules of international law shall remain in force.

Article 19

Nothing in the present convention shall affect the provisions of any treaty, convention, or agreement in force between any of the high contracting parties relating to nationality or matters connected therewith.

Article 20

Any high contracting party may, when signing or ratifying the present convention or acceding thereto, append an express reservation excluding any one or more of the provisions of articles 1 to 17 and 21.

The provisions thus excluded can not be applied against the contracting party who has made the reservation nor relied on by that party against any other contracting party.

Article 21

If there should arise between the high contracting parties a dispute of any kind relating to the interpretation or application of the present convention and if such dispute can not be satisfactorily settled by diplomacy, it shall be settled in accordance with any applicable agreements in force between the parties providing for the settlement of international disputes.

In case there is no such agreement in force between the parties, the dispute shall be referred to arbitration or judicial settlement, in accordance with the constitutional procedure of each of the parties to the dispute. In the absence of agreement on the choice of another tribunal, the dispute shall be referred to the Permanent Court of International Justice, if all the parties to the dispute are parties to the convention of December 16, 1920, relating to the statute of that court, and if any of the parties to the dispute is not a party to the convention of December 16, 1920, the dispute shall be referred to an arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with The Hague convention of October 18, 1907, for the pacific settlement of international disputes.

Article 22

The present convention shall remain open until December 31, 1930, for signature on behalf of any member of the League of Nations or of any nonmember state invited to the first codification conference or to which the council of the League of Nations has communicated a copy of the convention for this purpose.

Article 23

The present convention is subject to ratification. Ratifications shall be deposited with the secretariat of the League of Nations.

The secretary general shall give notice of the deposit of each ratification to the members of the League of Nations and to the nonmember States mentioned in article 22, indicating the date of its deposit.

Article 24

As from January 1, 1931, any member of the League of Nations and any nonmember state mentioned in article 22 on whose behalf the convention has not been signed before that date may accede thereto.

Accession shall be effected by an instrument deposited with the secretariat of the League of Nations. The secretary general of the League of Nations shall give notice of each accession to the members of the League of Nations and to the nonmember states mentioned in article 22, indicating the date of the deposit of the instrument.

Article 25

A procès-verbal shall be drawn up by the secretary general of the League of Nations as soon as ratifications or accessions on behalf of 10 members of the League of Nations or nonmember states have been deposited.

A certified copy of this procès-verbal shall be sent by the secretary general of the League of Nations to each member of the League of Nations and to each nonmember state mentioned in article 22.

Article 26

The present convention shall enter into force on the ninetieth day after the date of the procès-verbal mentioned in article 25 as regards all members of the League of Nations or nonmember states on whose behalf ratifications or accessions have been deposited on the date of the procès-verbal.

As regards any member of the league or nonmember state on whose behalf a ratification or accession is subsequently deposited, the convention shall enter into force on the ninetieth day after the date of the deposit of a ratification or accession on its behalf.

Article 27

As from January 1, 1936, any member of the League of Nations or any nonmember state in regard to which the present convention is then in force may address to the secretary general of the League of Nations a request for the revision of any or all of the provisions of this convention. If such a request, after being communicated to the other members of the league and nonmember states in regard to which the convention is then in force, is supported within one year by at least nine of them, the council of the League of Nations shall decide, after consultation with the members of the League of Nations and the nonmember states mentioned in article 22, whether a conference should be specially convoked for that purpose or whether such revision should be considered at the next conference for the codification of international law.

The high contracting parties agree that if the present convention is revised the revised convention may provide that upon its entry into force some or all of the provisions of the present convention shall be abrogated in respect of all of the parties to the present convention.

Article 28

The present convention may be denounced.

Denunciation shall be effected by a notification in writing addressed to the secretary general of the League of Nations, who shall inform all members of the League of Nations and the nonmember states mentioned in article 22.

Each denunciation shall take effect one year after the receipt by the secretary general of the notification but only as regards the member of the League or nonmember state on whose behalf it has been notified.

Article 29

1. Any high contracting party may, at the time of signature, ratification or accession, declare that, in accepting the present convention, he does not assume any obligations in respect of all or any of his colonies, protectorates, overseas territories, or territories under suzerainty or mandate, or in respect of certain parts of the population of the said territories; and the present convention shall not apply to any territories or to the parts of their population named in such declaration.

2. Any high contracting party may give notice to the secretary general of the League of Nations at any time subsequently that he desires that the convention shall apply to all or any of his territories or to the parts of their population which have been made the subject of a declaration under the preceding paragraph, and the convention shall apply to all the territories, or the parts of their population named in such notice, six months after its receipt by the secretary general of the League of Nations.

3. Any high contracting party may at any time declare that he desires that the present convention shall cease to apply to all or any of his colonies, protectorates, overseas territories, or territories under suzerainty or mandate, or in respect of certain parts of the population of the said territories, and the convention shall cease to apply to the territories or to the parts of their population named in such declaration one year after its receipt by the secretary general of the League of Nations.

4. Any high contracting party may make the reservations provided for in article 20 in respect of all or any of his colonies, protectorates, overseas territories, or territories under suzerainty or mandate, or in respect of certain parts of the population of these territories at the time of signature, ratification, or accession to the convention or at the time of making a notification under the second paragraph of this article.

5. The secretary general of the League of Nations shall communicate to all the members of the League of Nations and nonmember states mentioned in Article 22 all declarations and notices received in virtue of this article.

Article 30

The present convention shall be registered by the secretary general of the League of Nations as soon as it has entered into force.

Article 31

The French and English texts of the present convention shall both be authoritative.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Is this resolution much more than a mere gesture?

Mr. FISH. It is far more than an ordinary gesture. It declares a definite policy on the part of the United States that we believe in equality in nationality without distinction as to sex.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. But, that is for the United States. Does not the first part of the resolution go quite a little farther and undertake to point a finger as to what other countries of the world may or should do?

Mr. FISH. No. We have no power to do that; but this is not a gesture, because if we do not announce this policy at that time, they will proceed to write into the international code certain inequalities against women.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. That is exactly what I am intimating. We are by resolution endeavoring to direct action of other countries.

Mr. FISH. That is the purpose of the resolution.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. This, then, is an effort to prevent some international body from doing something?

Mr. FISH. Exactly. It is to uphold the hands of our delegates and try to prevent, as far as possible, the Old World from writing in inequalities against women in a proposed world code, which will be international law for generations to come.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Suppose this international body undertakes to say, as another international body did, that the matter of immigration is too much a world subject to be a domestic matter for any nation, what would we do then?

Mr. FISH. Of course, we would oppose it. If they did that, then we should adopt a declaration of policy, if necessary, so that they would not proceed with any such proposition, so that they would know in advance that we would have nothing to do with such a code.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If we get into the habit of adopting resolutions congratulating or revising or remonstrating against what international bodies do, we are liable to establish precedents that will carry us some time a long way afield, although I think this one is harmless.

Mr. FISH. The gentleman from Washington is correct. It is not good practice to pass a declaration of this kind unless it is to accomplish some object.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. What is the object?

Mr. FISH. It is to serve notice on the rest of the world that we not only uphold the hands of our delegates, but that we declare absolute equality for both sexes in nationality to be our policy, and if any inequalities based on sex is written into an international code we will reject it. If we do not take this action, I know of no way of preventing foreign nations from proceeding with the international code and writing into international law an unequal status for women in nationality that will be the guiding principle for years to come.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. What we may wish to declare as our own United States policy with respect to equality of the sexes is all right. That is one thing. But when we undertake to direct, even by indirection, the policies of other nations, that is quite another. If we do it on one thing, we may have to do it on another, and thus we might have the House of Representatives from time to time bringing resolutions out of committees either endorsing or protesting or giving direction to some international body, hoping thus to influence treaties.

Mr. FISH. Well, if it is necessary, then it should be done. In this case it happens to be necessary, and I do not believe there is any sound reason why the House of Representatives should not exercise our proper influence on the public opinion of the world on this or any other national or even international policy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. In between times, not only in this forum, but on the public platform, in the press, and elsewhere, we cry out against entangling alliances and denounce the efforts of other countries to dabble into and attempt to direct our internal affairs.

Mr. FISH. That is what we are trying to prevent, by taking action in time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Well, I am afraid that the policy is fraught with danger.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has expired.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield one additional minute to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FISH. I want to put in the RECORD the planks of the different party platforms on the subject of equality of rights for women. The following is quoted from the platform of the Democratic Party, formulated in June, 1928:

We declare for equality of women with men in all political and governmental matters.

The platform of the Republican Party contained the following plank:

The Republican Party, which from the first has sought to bring this development about, accepts wholeheartedly equality on the part of women.

I trust that this resolution will pass without amendment, as it has the entire support of the committee and of all the women in the United States of America. [Applause.]

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mrs. OWEN].

Mrs. OWEN. Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen, I am very glad to have the opportunity of saying a word in approval of this bill; first, because this bill bears a direct relationship to a problem which has been very close to my own experience, and, secondly, because it deals with an underlying principle which is a matter of vital interest to the women of the United States.

Those of you who are familiar with the details of my own election contest know that it was possible to contest the right of a woman born in the United States of American parentage, with a family line so directly American that it includes 11 ancestors under arms in the Revolution, to occupy a seat in this body on the ground that she had not been sufficiently long an American citizen to entitle her to that right.

Because of that recent experience of my own, the nationality laws of our country are a matter of deep personal concern. But if this matter was one of concern to myself alone I should not feel that I had the right to address you. The principle approved in this resolution, that our country should recognize no sex discrimination in the matter of nationality, is one which this Congress itself has approved by its own action, one which

both of the great political parties of our country have approved by their own statements, and one which was being tested when the American representatives at The Hague were asked to take part in signing a code which was not in accord with these principles.

In order that they should accurately represent the feeling of our Nation as expressed in the laws of Congress, and as affirmed by the statement of our political parties, and as implied in the sentiment of the people of our country, our American representatives took a stand alone against the other nations. The nationality laws in the world now in regard to women are in a fluid state. There is an extraordinary range of differing laws. If you study the nationality laws of the different nations of the world you will find that in some 13 nations men and women have exactly the same nationality rights under the laws of their countries. In several other nations they approximate equality. In still other nations as soon as a woman marries her nationality is lost. There is no recognition of the dignity and individuality of her citizenship. It has been recognized that it is desirable that there should be some degree of conformity between the nations on this subject.

This conference called at The Hague had for one of its major purposes the codification of these nationality laws. It has been recognized that little by little we must approximate international understanding and agreement. When our representatives went to The Hague and saw that the codification of these laws was crystallizing in a form which was unjust toward the nationality of women the American representatives stood aside and refused to sign the convention. They took a stand in favor of the view of the new world as against the old view, and we are asking Congress to recognize their action with approval and to express by resolution what has already been implied by legislation passed in Congress.

I feel that if this is an unprecedented action it is warranted by the importance of the underlying principle.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the Member from Florida yield?

Mrs. OWEN. With pleasure.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Part of this resolution is right and proper. It reads:

Resolved further, That it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States of America that there should be absolute equality for both sexes in nationality—

And so forth. It would be all well and good if Congress wanted to make such a declaration, because that is in line with legislation that is being enacted from time to time by the Congress. That part of the proposal is in full accord with the platform declarations of both political parties. But the resolution also provides:

That the Congress of the United States of America expresses its approval of the action of the United States delegation at The Hague Conference of 1930.

Why is it necessary for Congress to do that?

Mrs. OWEN. It may not be necessary, but I think it is appropriate. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. It may be appropriate in an effort to secure the equality of the sexes throughout the world in the course of time, but I am inclined to think that this embarks the Congress of the United States on the precedent of attempting to direct the internal doings of other countries. Now this is proposed to be done in a body that is not the treaty-making body. Also, it makes this House pay attention to international conferences held elsewhere in the world.

Mrs. OWEN. I think it is very important that we should pay attention to what is done in international conferences. If I may answer the gentleman, this resolution does not approve or disapprove the action of the conference itself. It approves the action of the American delegates in refusing to allow international law to be crystallized in such a way as to do an injustice to women.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. OWEN. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNELL. Is not this the only manner in which we could direct the attention of the world to the fact that the American people are behind the action of its delegates to this convention?

Mrs. OWEN. It is the only way I know to direct the attention of the nations to this.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. In 1924 an international conference was held in Geneva and American observers were present. They were there to be observers in order to see what was going to happen, but after full conference it was decided that they were not there to even cast one dissenting vote. That conference dealt with several international matters, among others

immigration, and the stand was taken that immigration was too great a subject to be treated as an international matter by any country. No one came back here to enter a protest or confirmation of that by a resolution of the House.

Mrs. OWEN. I understood the gentleman to say they were observers and not active participants in the conference.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. They might have been participants, but actually were observers and went in and came out somewhat as these women went in and came out of this conference.

Mrs. OWEN. Gentlemen were also members of our American delegation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I would say ladies and gentlemen, then, including several unofficial delegates, Miss Stevens and others. All the American delegation to that conference did was to cast its protesting vote of one. Was not that true of this conference, that there was a protesting vote of one?

Mrs. OWEN. No. The whole delegation took a stand against the 40 votes which were cast for a codification of the laws in opposition to the American spirit.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. It amounted then to—

Mrs. OWEN. To a protesting vote on the part of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. As one unit of the United States.

Mrs. OWEN. As one United States unit; yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. OWEN. Yes.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. This was a conference for the codification of laws. We sent a delegation there representing the United States. On this particular question they had no direct instructions or mandate, and now we are simply announcing that their action meets with the approval of the Congress.

Mrs. OWEN. The gentleman states the matter correctly.

Mr. FISH. If the gentlewoman will permit, there were four men among the delegates and only one woman, and this is merely the approval of the Congress, representing the people, of the action taken by the delegates representing the State Department?

Mrs. OWEN. Yes.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. OWEN. Yes.

Mr. RAMSEYER. This was a convention on certain questions relating to the conflict of nationality laws. Was that the only subject of law that was under consideration by this Hague conference?

Mrs. OWEN. No; that was not the only subject. The relations between the nations on the high seas were also under consideration. But we are only approving the action in regard to this one decision, and we are not asking a study to be made or approval of any other action taken by the conference.

Mr. RAMSEYER. If we take this action of approval, will it hold up the codification of all international law?

Mrs. OWEN. No; because the United States refused to sign the codification in its present form.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Because they did not consider the sexes equal?

Mrs. OWEN. Yes.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Then this is holding up the codification of all international law?

Mrs. OWEN. Not at all. They have proceeded, except that the United States is not one of the signers.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Is this important enough that we should hold up the codification of international law if 39 out of the 40 nations are in favor of it? Should we stand out just because the other 39 do not agree with us or—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from Florida has expired.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes more to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Or had we better go along and help them codify international law without this subject in it, with the hope that later we can convince them that by amendment, or otherwise, this idea should be incorporated in international law?

Mrs. OWEN. Do I understand the gentleman, himself, is in sympathy with equality of the sexes in nationality and the gentleman is merely questioning whether that end would be attained more quickly by compromising with the other nations or by taking an individual stand? Is that the position of the gentleman?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Well, the action of our delegates to the convention referred to in the resolution is new to me, and I am asking the questions for information.

Mrs. OWEN. Yes.

Mr. RAMSEYER. And what I want to know is whether we should hold up the codification of international law just be-

cause on this particular subject 39 nations are against us and we are alone. Are we holding up the codification of international law because of our position on the idea expressed in this resolution? It occurs to me that if this is the only thing in the way of codification of international law we should go along with the other 39 nations and codify international law, and then maybe later persuade the other 39 nations to our way of thinking in regard to sex equality so far as nationality is concerned.

Mrs. OWEN. May I answer the gentleman by a question? If you were asked to surrender the dignity of your own citizenship in order to get some compromise, would you be willing to accept less than a complete right to hold your American nationality inviolate?

Nationality is a sacred possession, equally sacred to men and to women. Our American nationality was purchased for us by the sacrifice of our forefathers. It has been safeguarded by the devotion of our citizenry, both in war and in peace; and as the American woman has borne uncomplainingly her share in the privations of pioneering, as by her example and precept in the home and in the school she has helped to shape the patriotic ideals of our people, as she has borne her share of the burden in time of war, both by her personal service and by the gift of that which is dearer to her than life itself, the child she has borne and raised to manhood, it is fitting that the Government of our country should have recognized by its law the right of the American woman to the same dignity and individuality of citizenship which has always been accorded the American man. In declaring as a national policy this fundamental principle which has been recognized by our law, the United States of America holds aloft a sure light which will give hope and courage to all women. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. No woman American citizen surrenders her own citizenship under any circumstances. She is protected by our laws, but she is reaching out and wanting other countries to do the same thing.

Mrs. OWEN. No; she is refusing to surrender the principle.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. But she holds the American citizenship that Congress gave her or that she was born to.

Mrs. OWEN. Exactly.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. And that far she is right.

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. Will the gentlewoman permit me to interrupt in order to answer the question asked by the gentleman from Iowa? As I understand, there were only three subjects which were under negotiation and study at this conference; one was territorial waters, I have forgotten the second one, and the third question concerned nationality. A failure to agree on the question of nationality in no wise affects the ability of the American representatives at this conference to go ahead and study the other features of international law.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Well, that adds a new phase to the subject. Do I understand then that these 39 nations and the United States did agree on codification of international law so far as the question of territorial waters is concerned?

Mr. MORTON D. HULL. I do not know how far they got in the consideration of that question.

Mr. FISH. No; they did not agree at all, and this is the only way we have to change the attitude of the foreign governments—by action of Congress. They will then realize we are serious and that we mean what we say and that we believe in equality for both sexes in nationality.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Understand me, I am not out of sympathy with this resolution, so far as the United States is concerned. The only question in my mind is whether we ought to hold up the whole codification of international law when we have no support from the other nations for the idea embodied in this resolution.

This does not change the attitude of the United States on the question of equality of nationality for both sexes. Our own laws settle that.

Mr. FISH. After this resolution goes through we will have more support.

Mr. TEMPLE. Will the gentlewoman from Florida yield?

Mrs. OWEN. Yes.

Mr. TEMPLE. It is not a question of whether the Congress is going to hold up the codification of international law or not. Our delegates to this conference did hold it up on this point. Their work is done, and the only question is whether we approve or whether we disapprove of what the representatives of this Nation did, in harmony with our laws. [Applause.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I would like to ask a question for information. Did the delegates to this conference at The Hague report to Congress?

Mrs. OWEN. They reported to the State Department.

Mr. FISH. The chairman of this delegation appeared before the Committee on Foreign Affairs and made a very detailed report on the entire proceeding and on the vote on every article.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Was that an official act on the part of this delegation after they had attended this international conference?

Mr. TEMPLE. No. May I reply to that question of the gentleman?

Mrs. OWEN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TEMPLE. The fact is that the negotiation of a treaty is in the hands of the President. The gentleman would not need to be reminded of that fact if he had not asked the question. Men sent abroad to negotiate a treaty do not report to the Congress.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I understand that thoroughly.

Mr. TEMPLE. They report to the President; and if they had signed a treaty, that treaty would have gone to the Senate. They did not sign it, and therefore nothing goes to the Congress or to the Senate.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I understand that thoroughly. I am trying to bring out that point. Of course, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. TEMPLE], with his long experience on the Foreign Affairs Committee, would have far superior knowledge to mine with respect to the procedure with reference to sending delegates abroad to an international conference and the place to which they report. The purpose they had in mind in the making of a treaty and the subject to be considered is one thing. The report of these delegates to the State Department and to the President is another thing, and action in the House of Representatives is still another thing. Treaties are not made here; and with all due respect—disliking very much to get into this dispute, and not wanting to take up the time of the gentlewoman from Florida, which I hope will be extended—I have grave doubt as to the wisdom of the House of Representatives going so far in this matter.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. OWEN. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. I know it would be of some importance to me, and possibly to other Members, if we could find out who these delegates were.

Mrs. OWEN. I think the list of delegates was read by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]. The chairman of our delegation was David Hunter Miller. I have not the exact list of delegates here.

Mr. FISH. David Hunter Miller, of the State Department, was the head delegate. There was a delegate from the State Department and from the Labor Department, and Mrs. Shipley, from the visa bureau.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. They were all Government employees, and they spoke for the attitude of the country.

Mr. FISH. They spoke for the attitude of the State Department.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. This resolution indorses the expression of certain employees of the Government.

Mr. FISH. No; the gentleman at the head of the committee was a distinguished Democrat.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. If they had been selected from the public at large it might present a different situation.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Probably the most experienced diplomatic negotiator in this country, James Brown Scott, appeared before the committee and gave information upon this matter in detail, and he earnestly urged that action be taken, and a notification to the world of what this Government believed to be right. I do not think if that is the purpose of the resolution to tell the world what we believe, and where we stand, that it can do any harm to say so.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Without going into the merits of the resolution, I think it is an attempt to save the face of Government employees or the heads of departments for—using a slang expression—"busting up" the conference. This looks like a gesture to save their face at this time.

Mr. BLOOM. Let me say that the way I understand it is that the delegates are acting under instructions from the State Department. They were not acting by themselves, but under instructions from the State Department here.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like a minute or so.

Mr. TEMPLE. I yield a minute to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I have given very little study to this, but I think it is as much as the average Member has given. I do not believe in the House going outside at present of the proper field of legislation in this way. The Foreign Affairs Committee of the House has asked the House to pass

upon something that is within the power of the President and the Senate. It is not within the proper domain of the House of Representatives. For one I have supported woman's suffrage and equality for women, but I have not gotten to the point where I am ready to say what must be the law or practice of any other nation.

I am not one that is certain that the Senate of the United States is always right. I think the Senate has mixed in things that are not in its proper domain. But the ratification of treaties and the consideration of and approval of the codification of international law is not within the province of the House. It is within the province of the Senate. Therefore, I do not believe that the House should speedily or hastily declare a thing of this kind when the committee has heard only one side.

Two or three years ago in reference to the World Court we hastily adopted a resolution that had no effect to advance the World Court. It only put the House Members on record hastily and without proper consideration. I do not believe we should again repeat that mistake.

Mr. HOWARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAMTON. If I have the time.

Mr. HOWARD. In view of the statement by the gentleman that the Senate is not always right, that it does not always do the right thing, why does the gentleman hesitate to give the Senate advice?

Mr. CRAMTON. Well, the Senate has overlooked many occasions when they had an opportunity to take advice from the House, and I have no reason to expect that they would profit by any advice that we might give them now. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield? This is not without precedent. Some time ago the House of Representatives passed a resolution asking the President to call a conference for the limitation of naval armament.

The House has frequently declared its opinion to the world by House resolution on a variety of subjects. A little more than a hundred years ago, in his first great speech made in this body, Daniel Webster introduced a resolution, which was passed, declaring to the world our sympathy with the struggle of the Greek Nation for independence, because he thought it was right, although many other nations were opposed to them. As I understand the proponents of this resolution, they think the resolution is right, and that we have taken a position that is irrevocable.

Mr. CRAMTON. This is not a resolution declaring the sympathy of Congress with struggling women throughout the world. It is merely a resolution indorsing the action of certain delegates, which action this House knows very little about. All it knows about it has been presented by those who wanted the delegation to take that action, possibly the delegates themselves, in an ex parte way. I do not believe the House ought to mix in the proposition, certainly not with the very limited information we now have.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. COOPER].

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, just a word in reply to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON]. If there is anything that the House of Representatives ought to begin to do and to do thoroughly, it is, I think, to exercise its constitutional right to express its opinion upon questions of national policy. [Applause.] People talk about the House losing the respect of the country. If it is losing that respect, it is, in part at least, because of arguments like that of the gentleman from Michigan, that we, the representatives of the American people, must not upon questions of national policy express an opinion.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. Is not this a question of international rather than national policy?

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Not at all. It is a question purely of national policy. The gentleman has misread the resolution, and also, in my judgement, has misinterpreted it. When the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MOORE] rose, I was trying to get the floor in order to cite the same precedent which he cited. Daniel Webster, one of the greatest statesmen the world has ever known, introduced, during his first term in this House, a resolution calling upon the House of Representatives to express its sympathy with the Greek people struggling against Turkish tyranny. It was objected then, as the gentleman from Michigan objects now, that this House should refrain from doing any such thing, because the Senate had all to do with national treaties.

Mr. CRAMTON. It is not a treaty; it is the matter of expressing an opinion.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I make a point of order against the word

"treaties" in the resolution, as not being within the jurisdiction of this House.

The SPEAKER. It is very well known in the House that the Chair refuses to rule on questions of constitutionality.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Then I make the point of order on the question of the jurisdiction of the House, that the House has no jurisdiction to pass a resolution dealing with treaties.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from New York had made his point of order earlier, before the House undertook the consideration of the resolution, the Chair would have ruled on the question; but the resolution has been debated, and the House has taken jurisdiction, and the question of the jurisdiction of the committee to report it would now come too late.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I hesitated quite a bit before I undertook to ask a few questions for information from the distinguished author of this bill, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], and the equally distinguished legislator from Florida [Mrs. OWEN]. But I feel that I have done right. I have been rewarded in seeing this debate accelerated. It is now clear that the resolution under consideration is something more than a mere perfunctory resolution. One part of it, as I have pointed out, is good and highly desirable. Now, then, even though our delegates were quite right in walking out of that Hague conference, I feel that in undertaking to vote approval as expressed in the other part of this resolution, we are getting into the internal affairs of other nations. It may be by indirection, but are we not doing it?

I feel, I know, that even though each and every one of us here is firmly of the belief that every woman in the United States should have every right that every man in the United States has—it is our policy, what is more, we hope that the equalities that we in the United States are extending to the women here will be extended to the women of other nations by the laws of their governments—yet I feel so sure that we are treading on dangerous ground when we endeavor to enact the first part of this resolution that I have not hesitated to call attention to that belief. We all appreciate the painful and unfortunate difficulties that befell Mrs. OWEN in the contest against her for her seat in Congress, which charges were unjustified in the first place.

Our committee, familiar with the Cable Act of 1922, offered to her its aid, which she did not need. Her problem ran to the meaning of the Cable Act of September 22, 1922, which gave to women who were married after that date to aliens rights equal to those given to other women—separate and independent citizenship. But that act did not give that right to those women who had married aliens prior to that date. Congress at this very moment is trying to correct that situation. Only two weeks ago this House, by unanimous consent, passed a bill to give to those American women married prior to 1922 the same rights as Americans that the women married after that date have already received. That bill is now in the Senate. Unfortunately the other body has loaded enough amendments on it to sink a ship. Ten or twelve other naturalization and citizenship bills are riding on that bill, hoping to fly through on the wings of the woman's citizenship bill because the latter is popular. My friends, the women leaders and the women voters do not want one single thing that the men do not want. I am not afraid to speak here in the House, because the women who are in this movement are themselves fair. They do not insist that one part of this resolution be carried because of the strength and righteousness of the other part. I fully believe that the second part, affirming our policy as to the rights of women, will do just as much good in helping to extend that policy abroad as the other part—probably more good.

The House has acted to cure the Cable Act. Other legislation in behalf of woman's equality are in prospect. We are about to vote.

Members will come trooping in through the lobby doors and will find that the yea vote is the popular one—the easy vote—but I believe it has been my duty to ask for more information and to point to certain dangers. We have had only a little knowledge of this from the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, but we know a little more about it, but we do not know the details of this conference at The Hague. We do not know anything about the report to the State Department. There seem to be no printed reports from the committee. I ask you to notice the language in the second part of the resolution:

Resolved further, That it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States of America that there should be absolute equality for both sexes in nationality and that in the treaties, law, and practice of

the United States relating to nationality there should be no distinction based on sex.

That says what it should be, but it is not what it is now. Rights are not yet equal even in the United States. So that declaration is good. That part of the resolution is all right. At the proper time, if possible, I shall move to strike out all of the first paragraph.

I believe if you stop for a moment and consider the matter you will conclude that it is hardly our business in a matter of this kind to undertake to point the way to the European nations when we have had so much trouble about the League of Nations, and are in so much doubt about the World Court. We should remember that one lady Member of this body, the present Member from Illinois [Mrs. McCORMICK], won her candidacy for nomination to the other body by proclaiming throughout the State of Illinois against entangling alliances. What she did, fellow Members, we should and can do here. She has set us an example. Pass the second part of this resolution; let the first part wait, and you will not regret it. [Applause.]

I thank you for your attention.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT rose.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wish to inquire as to the resolution before the House, whether it is divisible, so that we can have a separate vote on the two resolutions?

As to the first resolution, a Member sitting near me suggests that it can be stricken out, but I apprehend that that opportunity will not be accorded. My inquiry is whether under the rules of the House we may have the opportunity to have a separate vote on each of the respective resolutions.

The Chair will notice that the first resolve refers to the action of our delegates at The Hague Conference on the Codification of International Law. We have not yet been informed authoritatively by any member of the committee just what the action of the delegates was. We are acting in the dark.

As to the second resolution, it is a declaration of national policy. There may be some Members here who would like to vote against the first part of the resolution who may be willing to vote for the second resolve.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. STAFFORD. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I would like to ask if under the rules it would be permissible for me to be recognized to strike out the language from line 3 to the end of line 7?

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania yields, the gentleman from Washington could do that.

Mr. STAFFORD. Otherwise, the only thing that the gentleman could do would be to move to recommit and strike out that resolve.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I simply rose to clear up in my own mind as well as in the minds of others the question whether or not we are to understand that our delegates, when there were up for consideration other questions than this particular subject, such as maritime matters, walked out of that conference and refused to take further part in it because they could not secure an agreement in the conference as to the question of women's rights and women's nationality.

Mr. FISH. I will say to the gentleman that the other questions that were raised there had to do with territorial waters and the responsibilities of nations for damages and injuries to aliens. The consideration of those questions was not completed, and no vote was taken on them, and the conference adjourned without a second vote on either of these two issues. The only convention that was completed was that concerning nationality, which is the question now pending before the House. In answering the question of the gentleman, I would say that our delegates did not leave the conference until the conference adjourned.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. The fact is that they did not withdraw from that conference on account of this disagreement?

Mr. STAFFORD. Oh, yes; they did. The New York Times says they withdrew and would not act on other matters.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I do not understand that they did withdraw from this conference.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division of the question, and I call the Speaker's attention to paragraph 6 of Rule XVI, which says:

On the demand of any Member before the question is put, a question shall be divided if it includes propositions so distinct in substance that one being taken away a substantive proposition shall remain.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is familiar with that rule, but he doubts if it applies to a case like this. The Chair is of opinion that this resolution can not be divided. The Chair finds in the Manual, section 775, this:

In voting on the engrossment or passage of a bill or joint resolution a separate vote on the various portions may not be demanded. (V, 6144-6146.)

These decisions before the Chair are very old, as old as 1856.

Mr. STAFFORD. I can see the pertinency and correctness of the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks you can not divide the question here.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CRAMTON. Is it true that there is no opportunity to amend or recommit the bill?

The SPEAKER. It would be in order to move to recommit after the third reading.

Mr. CRAMTON. Then there would be an opportunity to recommit?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHINDBLOM].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for three minutes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. This resolution is very appealing with reference to the attitude and views of the Congress and people of the United States on the question of equality of the nationality of the sexes. I have, however, very serious doubt that we are serving any good purpose in the passage of this resolution. The codification of international law has been the subject of consideration by governments of the world for a long time. It is now in progress. Meetings of various kinds are being held looking toward the possibility, with the hope of realization, of the codification of the laws, upon which nations might agree.

Here we are taking one single question, piecemeal, and expressing our views upon that single problem that relates to this matter of international law. I think it is a wrong beginning for Congress to take up one question or another question or a third question relating to international law, which is the subject of codification and consideration the world over, and express its opinion upon that one single subject. Let us wait until some progress has been made in the codification of international law generally and until specific questions are submitted to Congress, whether we will agree to any particular form upon which the nations of the world have united, and which they are offering for our approval. For the present I think we should defer action upon this matter, and I hope a motion will be made to recommit this bill to the committee for further consideration.

So far as the references to treaties in the pending resolution are concerned, I think they should be omitted, as the jurisdiction as to them is entirely in the Senate. To that end the resolution should be properly amended.

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Speaker, there seems to be considerable misunderstanding about this resolution. It is not an attempt to say how other nations shall deal with women within their boundaries. The refusal of our delegates to sign a convention which was intended to be a chapter in the proposed international law code was a refusal to accept a law that would be binding on the United States as an international law but is out of harmony with our own law. We can not allow the nations of the world to impose upon us as international law principles that are contradictory of our domestic law. Now, what is the mode of procedure by which international law is made? There is no international legislative body to enact it. Some international law has grown up by custom as common law. In modern times the commoner method of getting changes in international law is by international conferences which draw up treaties, in which the signatory powers agree on a code or a partial code covering a certain subject. Such a treaty is recognized as a real source of international law but binding only upon the nations that have accepted it.

Our delegates at The Hague found presented to them or under consideration at the conference a chapter which would have been a part of a treaty which, in their judgment and in the judgment of the State Department, from which they were getting instructions from day to day, was out of harmony with our own domestic law. If that had been incorporated into a treaty and had been ratified by the Senate, it would have superseded our law. A treaty that is newer than the enacted statute is in force.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEMPLE. I yield.

Mr. CRAMTON. The second part of the resolution, lines 8 to 12, would certainly cover all that the gentleman argues for. We can understand that. We know what it is about. Whether it is within our jurisdiction or not is another question, but we do understand and know what it is about. But, lines 3 to 7, in which we are asked to indorse the actions of our representatives at the conference, when we have only the most imperfect and vague idea of the circumstances under which they acted, or as to the action itself, appeals to me as entirely unnecessary even from the viewpoint of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. TEMPLE. Oh, it is unnecessary.

Mr. CRAMTON. I am asking the gentleman if it would be agreeable to him to eliminate lines 3 to 7 from the resolution?

Mr. TEMPLE. I have no instruction from the committee to do that.

Mr. CRAMTON. And let the vote be taken simply on lines 8 to 11, or, will it be agreeable to the gentleman to give some one an opportunity to offer that amendment before the vote is taken?

Mr. TEMPLE. It is not within my power to prevent anybody offering that proposal in a motion to recommit.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman knows the practice of the House. It is certainly within the discretion of the gentleman to yield to the gentleman from Washington, for instance, to make a motion to amend, and give the House a chance to express itself.

Mr. TEMPLE. I do not think, under the limited authority conferred upon me by the committee, I have any right to yield for such an amendment.

Mr. CRAMTON. Then it is not the attitude of the committee that they are willing to give the House a chance to really express itself on this resolution?

Mr. TEMPLE. The House will have an opportunity to express itself by a motion to recommit.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEMPLE. I yield.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. I would like to ask a question for information. In the first paragraph of this resolution the language is:

Expresses its approval of the action of the United States delegation at the Hague Conference of 1930 on the Codification of International Law in voting against the convention on certain questions relating to the conflict of nationality laws.

What are those questions? Was there any evidence before the committee to show what questions they voted against? This leaves it in doubt.

Mr. TEMPLE. They voted against a convention on "certain questions" relating to a conflict in nationality laws.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. What were the questions relating to the nationality laws which they voted against?

Mr. TEMPLE. There was only one convention which they voted against, one agreement which took up a great many questions, because some of the points in that agreement were out of harmony with our own national policy which is expressed in the latter part of the resolution.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. We are asked to sustain the delegation in voting on "certain questions," and we have no knowledge what those questions are.

Mr. TEMPLE. They did not vote on a special question. They voted once against an agreement that had many items in it, and some of those items doubtless all of us would have approved of.

Mr. BRAND of Georgia. Still we do not know what they are.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEMPLE. I yield.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I am confused about the language quoted:

Convention on certain questions relating to the conflict of nationality laws.

A conflict of nationality law is a conflict of intranational law, it seems to me, and not international law. It is a conflict between the laws of several States dealing with international affairs.

Mr. TEMPLE. Each nation has its own nationality laws. For example, I might cite this to the gentleman: We naturalize people who come to the United States and conform to certain requirements. Italy does not recognize our naturalization. Further than that, if an American child, American under our law, born in this country after the father was naturalized, goes back to Italy, under the law of Italy that child is an Italian subject and may be put into the Italian Army, and that has been done. There is a conflict of nationality laws. According to our law, the boy is an American citizen; according to the law of Italy, he is an Italian. There are conflicts also with

reference to the nationality of married women. When an American man marries a British woman she does not, under our law, become an American citizen until she is naturalized, but she loses her citizenship in Great Britain, so that she is up in the air with no nationality. There are conflicts of nationality laws.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. May I make myself a little clearer? The question is, How does it happen that a convention dealing with international law takes jurisdiction of an intraconflict?

Mr. TEMPLE. By getting the nations to agree on international law the differences which exist with regard to those questions may be reconciled.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. But is that a question of international law?

Mr. TEMPLE. Not now, but the attempt was to make it so.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. What I am trying to ascertain from the gentleman is why an international conference should deal with domestic attitudes toward public questions. Is that a matter which ought to come within the jurisdiction of an international convention? That is what I am trying to ask.

Mr. TEMPLE. Each nation has its own laws now, and there is no generally accepted international law by which conflicting national laws may be reconciled.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. The point is, What business is that of a convention dealing with international questions?

Mr. TEMPLE. If a subject or citizen of one nation is forced into the army of another, and that nation is asked to release him, it might bring about such friction as would have serious consequences if the two nations did not reach an agreement in that regard. It is a matter that ought to be determined, and if all the nations can agree by a great international treaty that the thing shall be settled in a certain way, that agreement becomes international, and each nation having ratified it is henceforth bound by it.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Does the gentleman believe it would be a wise governmental policy for the world to deal with the domestic problems of the several governments?

Mr. TEMPLE. Never as to a problem that is only domestic.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Suppose this convention had undertaken to deal with some question with regard to which the Congress has jurisdiction. Does the gentleman believe that is a proper question to be submitted to the jurisdiction of an international convention?

Mr. TEMPLE. We have jurisdiction over the question of naturalization, but we have jurisdiction only within our own boundaries. We have no jurisdiction within the boundaries of other countries; yet, when a man who by our law has been declared a citizen goes outside of our jurisdiction, we want to protect him there, and we can do that only by international agreement.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Suppose that convention had not agreed with our laws with reference to naturalization?

Mr. TEMPLE. Then we would refuse to sign it, as we did. That is exactly what happened.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. It seems that 39 governments agreed to a proposition with regard to which we did not agree?

Mr. TEMPLE. Yes.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. The problem with which we did not agree seems to have been a problem that had to do with an international problem in those governments. Does the gentleman think we have anything to do with that?

Mr. TEMPLE. No. They would not accept our position, but wrote into the proposed agreement certain things that are out of harmony with the laws which Congress has passed, and we said, "No; we will not accept an international agreement that is out of harmony with the action that our Nation has already taken." [Applause.]

Mr. CRAMTON. Is the gentleman prepared to state to the House just the propositions he has referred to and just the details in which that agreement was in conflict with our national laws?

Mr. TEMPLE. I am afraid that if I attempted to read the whole of that contract—

Mr. CRAMTON. But before we are asked—

Mr. TEMPLE. Let me first answer the gentleman's question. I shall not allow him to treat me as if I were not able to answer one question and then proceed to ask me another question.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman is very able.

Mr. TEMPLE. I want to answer the question. If we undertook to take this contract, with as many clauses in it as it has, and should attempt to discuss them clause by clause, we would be discussing them until a time beyond which I hope this Congress will not extend.

Mr. CRAMTON. Will the gentleman permit a question now?

Mr. TEMPLE. Yes.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman is asking Congress to go on record as to propositions of which it is entirely in ignorance and which he does not communicate to the House.

Mr. TEMPLE. In my judgment, no Member of the Congress has the right to-day to be entirely ignorant about matters of such importance in which the United States Government has been engaged. [Applause.] It is a matter we ought to know about. The Government has been concerned in it for months.

Mr. CRAMTON. There are many Members of Congress, including myself, who are not able to know everything about everything.

Mr. TEMPLE. I am quite willing to make the same confession myself.

Mr. CRAMTON. And hence I am content to legislate on those things that are within the jurisdiction of the House under the Constitution, without infringing on the province of the Senate.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEMPLE. Yes.

Mr. HILL of Alabama. Under the circumstances would it not create a bad impression and maybe have a very bad effect for this House to-day to proceed to vote this resolution down?

Mr. TEMPLE. I rather think it would.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEMPLE. I promised to yield one minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

I yield one minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I want to repeat the observation that has just been made as to how this will be construed if the resolution is voted down.

These gentlemen opposing the resolution say they are in favor of the second section, which declares a policy, but they want to knock out the first section, which is simply an indorsement of that policy, which was carried out by our delegates over there. I think if the gentleman from Florida had been there as one of the delegates, we might have had better luck.

Columbus is about the only one who ever discovered America. Some of these other people over there are going to have to discover America. The real thing that is involved in this resolution is the onward march to freedom of womankind to full and equal treatment as individual citizens, and it is going to go on to fulfillment, and one of these days the men will be in here asking for legislation to give us equal rights and will want the help of the gentleman from Florida. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JOHNSON of Washington) there were—ayes 81, noes 15.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. It is evident there is not a quorum present.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. If the House adjourns at this time, this would go over until next Wednesday?

The SPEAKER. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 233, nays 15, not voting 179, as follows:

[Roll No. 47]

YEAS—233

Abernethy	Chalmers	Doxey	Green
Ackerman	Christgau	Drewry	Greenwood
Adkins	Christopherson	Driver	Gregory
Aldrich	Clague	Dunbar	Guyer
Allen	Clancy	Eaton, Colo.	Hadley
Almon	Clark, N. C.	Eaton, N. J.	Hall, Ind.
Andrew	Cochran, Mo.	Elliot	Hall, N. Dak.
Arentz	Cochran, Pa.	Eslick	Halsey
Arnold	Cole	Esterly	Hammer
Ayres	Colton	Evans, Calif.	Hare
Bacharach	Connerly	Fish	Hartley
Bacon	Cooke	Fisher	Hastings
Baird	Cooper, Tenn.	Fitzgerald	Haugen
Bloom	Cooper, Wis.	Fitzpatrick	Hickey
Bohn	Corning	Fort	Hill, Ala.
Bolton	Cox	Foss	Hill, Wash.
Bowman	Coyle	Free	Hoch
Box	Crall	Freeman	Hogg
Brand, Ga.	Cross	Fuller	Hooper
Brand, Ohio	Crosser	Fulmer	Hope
Briggs	Culkin	Gambrell	Hopkins
Brigham	Dallinger	Garber, Okla.	Howard
Buchanan	Darrow	Garner	Huddleston
Buckbee	Davenport	Garrett	Hudson
Burness	Davis	Gasque	Hull, Morton D.
Butler	Denison	Gibson	Hull, Tenn.
Byrns	DeRouen	Gifford	Irwin
Campbell, Iowa	Dickstein	Glover	Johnson, Ind.
Cannfield	Douglass, Mass.	Goodwin	Johnson, Nebr.
Carter, Calif.	Dowell	Granfield	Johnson, Okla.

Johnson, S. Dak.	Mapes	Rankin	Swanson
Johnson, Tex.	Martin	Reed, N. Y.	Swing
Jonas, N. C.	Menges	Reid, Ill.	Taber
Jones, Tex.	Michener	Robinson	Tarver
Kading	Miller	Rogers	Taylor, Tenn.
Kalin	Milligan	Romjue	Temple
Kendall, Ky.	Moore, Ky.	Rowbottom	Thompson
Kiefner	Moore, Ohio	Rutherford	Thurston
Kopp	Moore, Va.	Sanders, Tex.	Tilson
Kotell	Morhead	Sandlin	Treadway
LaGuardia	Nelson, Mo.	Seger	Underhill
Lankford, Ga.	Newhall	Schvrig	Vinson, Ga.
Lankford, Va.	Nolan	Shaffer, Va.	Walker
Larsen	Norton	Shott, W. Va.	Wason
Lea	O'Connell	Sinclair	Welch, Calif.
Leavitt	O'Connor, La.	Sloan	Whitley
Lehlbach	O'Connor, N. Y.	Smith, Idaho	Whittington
Linthicum	O'Connor, Okla.	Smith, W. Va.	Wigglesworth
Lozier	Oldfield	Snow	Williams
Luce	Owen	Speaks	Williamson
Ludlow	Palmisano	Spearing	Wilson
McClintock, Ohio	Patman	Sproul, Ill.	Wolverton, N. J.
McCormack, Mass.	Perkins	Sproul, Kans.	Wolverton, W. Va.
McKeown	Pittenger	Stalker	Woodruff
McLeod	Pratt, Ruth	Stegall	Woodrum
McMillan	Quinn	Stobbs	Wright
McSwain	Rainey, Henry T.	Strong, Pa.	
Maas	Ramey, Frank M.	Summers, Wash.	
Manlove	Ramspeck	Summers, Tex.	

NAYS—15

Bland	Dyer	Kennedy	Somers, N. Y.
Chindblom	Edwards	Ramseyer	Stafford
Craddock	Hull, Wis.	Schafer, Wis.	Wainwright
Cramton	Johnson, Wash.	Simmons	

NOT VOTING—179

Allgood	Doutrich	Kunz	Ransley
Andresen	Doyle	Kurtz	Rayburn
Aswell	Drane	Kvale	Reece
Auf der Heide	Ellis	Lambertson	Sabath
Bachmann	Englebright	Lampert	Sanders, N. Y.
Bankhead	Estep	Langley	Schneider
Barbour	Evans, Mont.	Lanham	Sears
Beck	Fenn	Leech	Seiberling
Beedy	Finley	Letts	Short, Mo.
Beers	Frear	Lindsay	Shreve
Bell	French	McClintic, Okla.	Simms
Black	Garber, Va.	McCormick, Ill.	Sirovich
Blackburn	Gavagan	McDuffie	Snell
Boylan	Golder	McFadden	Sparks
Britten	Goldsborough	McLaughlin	Stedman
Browne	Graham	McReynolds	Stevenson
Browning	Griffin	Magrady	Stone
Brumm	Hale	Mansfield	Strong, Kans.
Brunner	Hall, Ill.	Mead	Sullivan, N. Y.
Burdick	Hall, Miss.	Merritt	Sullivan, Pa.
Busby	Hancock	Michaelson	Swick
Cable	Hardy	Montague	Taylor, Colo.
Campbell, Pa.	Hawley	Montet	Thatcher
Cannon	Hess	Mooney	Timberlake
Carley	Hoffman	Morgan	Tinkham
Carter, Wyo.	Holaday	Mouser	Tucker
Cartwright	Houston, Del.	Murphy	Turpin
Celler	Hudspeth	Nelson, Me.	Underwood
Chase	Hull, William E.	Nelson, Wis.	Vestal
Clark, Md.	Igoe	Niedringhaus	Vincent, Mich.
Clarke, N. Y.	James	Oliver, Ala.	Warren
Collier	Jeffers	Oliver, N. Y.	Watres
Collins	Jenkins	Palmer	Watson
Connolly	Johnson, Ill.	Parker	Welsh, Pa.
Cooper, Ohio	Johnston, Mo.	Parks	White
Crisp	Kearns	Patterson	Whitehead
Crowther	Kelly	Peavey	Wingo
Cullen	Kemp	Porter	Wolfenden
Curry	Kendall, Pa.	Pou	Wood
Dempsey	Kerr	Prall	Wurzbach
De Priest	Ketcham	Pratt, Harcourt J.	Wyant
Dickinson	Kiess	Pritchard	Yates
Dominick	Kincheloe	Purnell	Yon
Doughton	Kinzer	Quayle	Zibelman
Douglas, Ariz.	Knutson	Ragon	

So the previous question was ordered.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Mr. Snell with Mr. Kincheloe.
Mr. McLaughlin with Mr. Warren.
Mr. Johnston of Missouri with Mr. Prall.
Mr. Kendall of Pennsylvania with Mr. Evans of Montana.
Mr. French with Mr. Kemp.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a motion to recommit that I hope to make to-morrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TILSON). The gentleman from Washington asks unanimous consent to print in the RECORD for the information of the House a motion that he intends to make to recommit the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The motion is as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington moves to recommit House Joint Resolution 331 to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, with instructions to return the same forthwith with the following lines stricken out: Lines 3 to 7, inclusive, and the words "Resolved further," in line 8.

TO PROMOTE AGRICULTURAL PROGRESS

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on a bill recently introduced by myself to promote agricultural progress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the question of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. McSWAIN. Mr. Speaker, please let me use this opportunity to make a brief explanation of the purpose and fundamental idea of H. R. 12481, a bill recently introduced by myself to promote agricultural progress. The mere legal framework of the bill does not convey to the reader the purpose and thought lying back of the bill and the ultimate object to be accomplished by operating under the provisions of the bill.

ORIGIN OF IDEA

A few years ago I was talking with a great and widely experienced leader in agricultural demonstrations and education, and while we both agreed that great progress has been made and great results have been achieved under such legislation as the Smith-Lever Act and similar legislation looking to trained and educated leadership and guidance for agriculture, yet we both deplored the fact that it may be several generations at the present rate of progress before we begin to approximate that degree of cooperation and scientific production and marketing manifested by the farm classes of Denmark. I asked this learned leader of agricultural education, "Is not there something else that we can do and ought to do within the limits of reason and practical statesmanship to drive forward at a higher rate of speed the advancement now going on?" He replied, "Yes; if I could spend \$50,000 a year in some one county of every agricultural State in the Union, and this to go on for a period of at least 10 years and to be in addition to the money now being spent in such county and in the States, I believe I could bring about such results in the one county as to be an example to all the other people of the State and that other counties will fall in line, and by following the example the development will soon become state-wide and, consequently, soon become nation-wide."

HOW THE PLAN WOULD WORK

Thereafter, my friend in a conversation of two or three hours went into great detail and in a manner that charmed my imagination and appealed to my judgment. The central idea is that \$50,000 a year, contributed equally by the State and the Federal Government, will appeal to all the counties in a State very powerfully and will enable the board, set up under the provisions of the bill, to conduct a lively competition among the counties. The board would specify as the factors of the competition absolute pledges and promises by all the interests of the county, to wit, the bankers, merchants, manufacturers, professional men, county authorities, educational institutions, and the farmers themselves, to cooperate with each other and with the program to be outlined by the board for the whole period of 10 years. In conducting the competition the board would require all of these several interests to obligate themselves in writing to manifest this spirit of cooperation by constructing cooperative creameries, cooperative canneries, cooperative packing houses, and to operate the same efficiently and economically. The farmers would bind themselves in writing to enter into a campaign of progressive and cooperative farming by increasing the number of cattle and swine, by soil building, by producing diversified crops, and by marketing these various products through cooperative associations using the creameries, canneries, and packing houses for the purpose of preparing these products for the market. Marketing agencies would be established and the farmers would be insured of the highest market prices for their products. The board would then consider which county had made the best showing in its plan and program of cooperative development, and considering the geographical situation, and other factors with reference to the entire State, the board would then pick the county and start the work.

Naturally the farmers from other counties would begin to visit, at various periods of the year, this demonstration county. As the work progressed in the demonstration county, as the number of cows and hogs increased, as the soil manifestly improved, as the diversification of crops became manifest, as the cooperative creameries, canneries, and packing houses began to show results, and as the cash accounts of the individual farmers began to improve, as farm mortgages began to disappear, and better farmhouses began to appear, as the farm families began to show happy and contented hearts reflected in smiling faces, the farmers of other counties and the business and professional men of other counties would see just how this great change has been brought about. With them it would not be necessary to spend the \$50,000 a year. That money is to be spent to show the people of one county how it can be done. After the people in the one demonstration county have demonstrated the results of such cooperative methods, then it will be easy for the people in other counties, both the business peo-

ple and the farm people, to follow the example, and thus the example will spread from county to county all over the State, and from State to State all over the Nation.

THE PLAN IS PRACTICAL AND WORKABLE

This plan proposes to deal with human nature as we find it. It proposes to deal with existing conditions. It does not propose to set up a little Utopia in a new promised land. It proposes to take the farmers as they now are, upon the land as it now is, under the depressing conditions as they now are, and to lead them out into agricultural prosperity. This is to be done by appealing to the natural human instinct of trying to get something that other people do not get, in the hope of surpassing others, but with the indirect result of blessing and helping others.

If you tell the people of the counties of a given State that some one county shall have \$50,000 a year spent in paying the salaries of leaders, instructors, helpers, and agents, then all the people of the State will be very anxious to have that money spent in their several counties. When the board sets up its competition there will be great activity among all the interests in every county, seeking to bring that \$50,000 a year to the county. Under such pressure all the interests of the county will gladly agree in writing to carry out the program outlined by the board. The board can then bind the people to a program of cooperation that seems otherwise impossible to obtain. I have engaged in campaigns of education for the purpose of trying to induce the farmers themselves to join cooperative marketing associations. It is very hard to obtain substantial results. But if by such a movement as here proposed we can get the bankers, the merchants, the manufacturers, the professional men, the housewives, the schools, the colleges, and the farmers all themselves stirred up in a competition and get them to lay down their individual jealousies and rivalries, their neighborhood envyings and differences, and to join in a program of county-wide development to last for a period of 10 years, then we are almost sure to get results. If we can get the people of one county to stick together for 10 years, the results will be so manifest in the blessing and betterment of such county, that they will never again fall into individual units and break up into neighborhood factions, but will constitute an integral agricultural unit for the purpose of producing and marketing a large variety of farm products. This will bring solid and permanent prosperity to the banks, to the merchants, to the manufacturers, to the professional people, to the schools and colleges, and primarily to the farmers and to the farmers' wives and farmers' families.

SUPERIOR TO OTHER PLANS

There is a plan that has been given much publicity and consideration which will involve the expenditure of tens of millions of dollars and is intended to set up neighborhood communities of agricultural producers under idealistic conditions. This plan is very good and is represented by the bills of distinguished and patriotic Members of Congress with great experience and with profound interest in agriculture, such as the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] with H. R. 10475 and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] with H. R. 1677. By this plan of acquiring at Federal expense huge tracts of cut-over and partially abandoned land and of inducing farm families to move into this area and to carry on, under Federal guidance, a program of diversified farming under cooperative conditions, necessarily limited in its application and in its lessons. Not all the farmers of the United States can or will or should abandon their farms as they now exist and move to such waste areas. Farmers operating under existing conditions would refuse to follow the practices set up in such idealistic community, as contemplated by the bills just mentioned, because the farmers would say that such a system could not be made to pay under the conditions now existing. They would say that only millions of Federal money could make the showing being made in such development projects. I do not wish to be understood as hostile in any respect to the legislation above referred to for the development of organized rural communities.

They will perform a useful service in showing the diversified adaptability of the soils and the possibilities of community cooperation. But I insist that the application of the lesson is limited and that agriculture as a whole will not generally profit by the lesson, and that the expenditure of the money involved would bring quicker and more far-reaching results if applied to the enlargement and expansion of the existing program of farm demonstration and to some such program as is sought to be outlined by H. R. 12481. But I will vote for the bill to set up these organized rural communities for the

reason that I will vote for any project that promises to set any worthy example and to teach any proper lesson to the farmers of our Nation.

THE CRUX OF THE QUESTION

The heart of the problem is to bring about cooperation among the farmers as they now live upon their own land and in the communities where they have been born and reared. We can not make over the Nation; we can not revolutionize property holding conditions; we can not destroy family, community, and county tradition. The problem therefore is to engraft upon economical and social conditions as they now exist in the farm counties a system and organization of cooperation in producing and in marketing that will bring to the farmer a maximum of profits for his labor. The county is the natural and legal unit for such organization.

The township or community is too small for that purpose. The county is already organized legally and socially as well as economically. County canneries, county creameries, and county packing houses may be made reasonably profitable from the start. In these days of good roads and automobiles a county is not as large in terms of time as a township was 20 years ago. Therefore it is useless to talk about organizing communities. The county must be the community. The life of the Nation is a century, and it has centered around the county. The roads lead to the county seats. The railroads tap the county seats. The banking, industrial, commercial, and manufacturing institutions have been set up with reference to the county as a whole. The problem, therefore, is to organize the county and not a community. Manifestly it is futile to think of purchasing an entire county and of reorganizing it under the plan contemplated by H. R. 1677, H. R. 8880, and H. R. 10475. The expense would be prohibitive. It would be unjust, uneconomical, and perhaps physically impossible. Since we can not take, therefore, an entire county and remodel it according to our idea, we will take an entire county as it now stands and try by leadership, by concentrated instruction, by multiplying the helpers and agents, by inducing the business men, such as bankers, merchants, and manufacturers, to cooperate with the farmers in producing and marketing their products, and thus slowly, it is true, but more quickly than is now being done, reform and rearrange the farm methods, both as to production and marketing, in one whole county in each State.

It is thought that 10 years will be sufficiently long to make a practical demonstration. During that period it would cost the Federal Government only \$250,000, and the other \$250,000 would be contributed by the State. At the end of the 10 years the county would be a living example of what the farmer and business people in all the other counties in the State can do. It is believed that the example will be so striking and impressive as to force itself upon the attention of the business men and farmers of other counties in the State. It is believed that such business men and farmers throughout the entire State will find it to their interest to copy that example and thus to make real the lessons taught by such example. These lessons will be practical because they will be applicable to conditions as they now are. The farmers now living will not be required to move from the land on which they are now living. They will still attend the same church. Their children will still attend the same school. But the land will quickly improve in fertility, the bank will increase in deposits, the farm mortgages will disappear, the farm homes will brighten in appearance, the farmers' children will be happy at their work because there will be hope in their hearts, and the entire life of the county will be invigorated in a striking and impressive manner.

WILL IT WORK?

I believe the plan will work because the States will see the wisdom of such demonstration on a county-wide basis and will gladly put up the additional \$25,000 a year. The people of the counties will enter into a most lively and vigorous competition in the hope of being made the beneficiaries of the \$50,000 a year in farm education, in leadership, in demonstration agents, in helpers and guides of all kinds in carrying out the program of cooperation. This will apply to all classes of citizens and perhaps more forcibly to the business and professional men than to the farmers themselves at first. With these motives behind the bill, it certainly will work.

PROBABLE OUTLINE OF PROGRAM

Most probably the board set up by the bill would contemplate and launch a program somewhat along the following lines: The board would outline a program for increasing the cows in a given county, binding the farmers not to kill or sell any female calves and to buy a certain number of high-bred cattle so as to increase the number of cows by 100 per cent every three years so that at the end of 10 years there should be eight times as many cows in the county as were when the program started.

The same program would apply to hogs. With more hogs and cows would come improvement in the soil. The farmers would be bound to diversify their crops, to adopt the use of clovers and other scientific and practical means of soil building.

Then the board would require the carrying out of the agreement to build a creamery to prepare the milk and cream for the market. Connected with the creamery would be a cheese factory. Furthermore, the cannery would be established to save for the market the surplus perishable vegetables and fruits. Next the packing houses would be built to take care of fruits, potatoes, and such products. The \$50,000 a year would hire enough men and women to keep constantly in touch with all the farmers and farm homes of the county, so that the same would be one busy group of people 12 months in the year. With improvement of the soil and with better methods of cultivation and the use of better seed, the quantity of such staple crops as cotton in our section of the country would not be reduced. But the acreage planted in cotton would be greatly reduced.

Due to better soil, better fertilization, and better methods, the same amount of cotton as now produced would be produced on about half the same acreage. The rest of the acreage would be devoted to grain crops, vegetables, and fruits, and the grain crops would be fed to cattle and hogs and chickens, and every day in the year thousands of dollars worth of butter and cheese, of canned vegetables and canned fruits, of dried fruits, of potatoes cured and preserved in proper packing houses, of eggs and chickens, of slaughtered pork products, of dozens of other farm products that do not just at this moment come to my memory. All this would be shipped from the various shipping points in the county and would bring back a constant flow of money amounting to thousands of dollars a day. Of course, in the fall of the year the same amount of cotton would bring its hundreds of thousands of dollars. Under such conditions as these, prosperity would prevail on the farms and among all the business and financial institutions of the county. Of course, it would mean work, and plenty of it, every day in the year. But where there is a return in sight, where there is a manifest reward for labor, people do not mind work. It is the natural order of things. It makes for law-abiding and loyal citizens. It makes for strength of character and for good health. It is the only way to permanent and enduring prosperity. It is God's plan for man's earthly success, and the wise and proper avenue for man's approach toward spiritual redemption.

But, under present conditions there is no encouragement to labor. With the farm mortgages constantly increasing by inability to meet the interest, with farm values shrinking, with the lands becoming more impoverished, with the buildings and improvements depreciating, with the value of the crops annually growing less, there is nothing but discouragement and despair facing the farmers of to-day. Consequently the tenant farmers are leaving the country wherever they can and gathering in the congested industrial and commercial centers. Most of the land-owners have already left the country many years ago and gone to town. To-day, in our southeastern section of the country I know of stretches of country where thousands of acres of land may be found in one body with practically no cultivation upon any part of it. What were once prosperous plantations, with fertile fields, full of busy men and horses and mules, are now abandoned to weeds and gullies. Something must be done in our part of the country at least. The soil is yearly becoming more impoverished. The thinner the soil, the more expensive the production of crops. It not only requires more fertilizer, but more labor. The purpose of my bill is to change this distressful condition of things. The purpose of my bill is to put ambition in the heart of the farmer. It is to show him the way. It is to prove to the farmer that cooperative farming and cooperative marketing can be engrafted upon our existing social and economic conditions, if we demonstrate that by a 10-year program in one county of each of the States we shall have taken a great forward step in the redemption of agriculture.

THE CONCLUSION OF THE WHOLE MATTER

The three indispensable principles necessary to agricultural progress, around which all other matters may be grouped as parts of the great whole, are soil building, diversification of crops, and cooperative marketing. The purpose of H. R. 12481 is to encourage all three of these fundamental principles. Furthermore, the purpose is that such encouragement shall be practical, common sense, and applicable to existing conditions. It is not intended to create a little Utopia here and there; it is not expected that conditions shall be ideal anywhere; but it is reasonable to believe that worth-while progress made along these lines in one county of the State will attract the attention of the people all over the State. Consequently the people from

all over the State will visit the county, and thus learn how the reformation was brought about. The farmers will never learn how to bring about soil building, diversification, and cooperation by merely reading. Neither will they learn these things by being talked to in mass or individually. The only way they can and ever will learn these things is by an actual physical demonstration made under conditions identical with those now existing, and under which the farmer lives. In other words, there is very little use or benefit in a farmer visiting an agricultural demonstration farm. He sees crops being produced under almost ideal conditions where there are unlimited Government resources. The crops thus produced are not profitable, when measured in terms of the expense. The farmer therefore turns away in disgust and disdain. He must farm for a living with no governmental subsidy back of him. On the other hand, I fear it will be of little benefit to the farmer in visiting one of these organized rural communities proposed to be set up at great expense upon cut-over and abandoned land by bringing the farmers and their families from other sections and countries.

Of course, any project can be made to look pretty if unlimited money be back of it. Water can be piped to a desert and artificial fertilizers applied and marvelous crops grown in the middle of the desert. But such beauty at such expense will never pay for land, will never pay the interest on mortgages, will never pay the taxes, will never support the farmers and their families, will never send the farmers' boys and girls to college, and will never enable the farmer to accumulate a sufficient reserve to take care of his old age and to give himself a decent burial. Farming must be some sort of profit-earning business. To be profit earning it must be based upon economical, social, and physical conditions as they now exist. The country can not be made over by a fell swoop. Economic and social conditions can not be revolutionized by the creation at great expense of a few idealistic and utopian communities. The remedy must apply to the existing disease; the patch must cover the existing rent in the cloth; the relief must suit the distress as we find it. I respectfully suggest that by the application of the principles involved in H. R. 12481, if administered in the spirit in which the bill was conceived, which spirit I have undertaken to set forth in this brief speech, I believe the desired results will be accomplished and that within the period of 10 years agriculture throughout the Nation will begin to reflect the results of the teaching by example contemplated by the bill, and that within 20 years every agricultural county in the Nation will show marvelous development and progress, and within 30 years our farm population will be changed from that state of poverty and distress and hopelessness in which they now flounder into a condition of financial independence, of economic prosperity, and of social happiness to which, under the laws of nature and of nature's God, they are entitled.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. STEVENSON, by unanimous consent, was given leave of absence for two weeks, on account of illness in family.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 185. An act to amend section 180, title 28, United States Code, as amended;

H. R. 7491. An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1931, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 9444. An act to authorize the erection of a marker upon the site of New Echota, capital of the Cherokee Indians prior to their removal west of the Mississippi River, to commemorate its location, and events connected with its history.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 428. An act to authorize the transfer of the former naval radio station, Seawall, Me., as an addition to the Acadia National Park;

S. 3185. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to dispose of material no longer needed by the Navy;

S. 3585. An act to eliminate certain land from the Tusayan National Forest, Ariz., as an addition to the Western Navajo Indian Reservation; and

S. 3817. An act to facilitate and simplify national-forest administration.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present

to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 1234. An act to authorize the Postmaster General to impose demurrage charges on undelivered collect-on-delivery parcels;

H. R. 8574. An act to transfer to the Attorney General certain functions in the administration of the national prohibition act, to create a bureau of prohibition in the Department of Justice, and for other purposes;

H. R. 9843. An act to enable the Secretary of War to accomplish the construction of approaches and surroundings, together with the necessary adjacent roadways, to the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in the Arlington National Cemetery, Va.;

H. R. 10340. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Arkansas State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the White River, at or near Calico Rock, Ark.; and

H. J. Res. 327. Joint resolution authorizing the presentation of medals to the officers and men of the Byrd Antarctic expedition.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TEMPLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, May 22, 1930, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Thursday, May 22, 1930, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Second deficiency bill.

COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(10.30 a. m.)

To amend section 8 of the act making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1914, and for other purposes, approved March 4, 1913 (H. R. 10742).

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

(10.30 a. m.)

Authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to accept, without cost to the Government of the United States, a lighter-than-air base near Sunnyvale, in the county of Santa Clara, State of California, and construct necessary improvements thereon (H. R. 6810).

Authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to accept a free site for a lighter-than-air base at Camp Kearny, near San Diego, Calif., and construct necessary improvements thereon (H. R. 6808).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII.

Mr. SEARS: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 8479. A bill to amend section 7 of Public Act No. 391, Seventieth Congress, approved May 15, 1928; with amendment (Rept. No. 1548). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 10582. A bill to provide for the addition of certain lands to the Lassen Volcanic National Park in the State of California; with amendment (Rept. No. 1550). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LAMPERT: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 2370. An act to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan police force and the fire department of the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1564). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. REECE: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 6340. A bill to authorize an appropriation for construction at the Mountain Branch of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, Johnson City, Tenn.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1566). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 12379. A bill to admit to the United States Chinese wives of certain American citizens; without amendment (Rept. No. 1565). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HAUGEN: Committee on Agriculture. S. 3950. An act authorizing the establishment of a migratory bird refuge in the Cheyenne Bottoms, Barton County, Kans.; with amendment (Rept. No. 1567). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ARENTZ: Committee on Indian Affairs. S. 134. An act authorizing an appropriation for the purchase of land for the Indian colony near Ely, Nev., and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1573). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LEAVITT: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 8529. A bill to provide for the establishment of the Yakima Indian Forest; with amendment (Rept. No. 1574). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GIBSON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 10816. A bill to construe the contract labor provisions of the immigration act of 1917 with reference to instrumental musicians, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1575). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. CLARK of North Carolina: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6659. A bill for the relief of Earl F. Heist; with amendment (Rept. No. 1545). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHRISTGAU: Committee on Claims. H. R. 11031. A bill to extend the benefits of the United States employees' compensation act of September 7, 1916, to Clara E. Nichols; without amendment (Rept. No. 1546). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BOX: Committee on Claims. S. 1406. An act for the relief of Mary S. Howard, Gertrude M. Caton, Nellie B. Reed, Gertrude Pierce, Katie Pensel, Josephine Pryor, Mary L. McCormick, Mrs. James Blanchfield, Sadie T. Nicoll, Katie Lloyd, Mrs. Benjamin Warner, Eva K. Pensel, Margaret Y. Kirk, C. Albert George, Earl Wroldsen, Benjamin Carpenter, Nathan Benson, Paul Kirk, Townsend Walters, George Freet, James B. Jefferson, Frank Ellison, Emil Kulchycky, Harold S. Stubbs, and the Bethel Cemetery Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1547). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RAMSPECK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 303. A bill for the relief of Charles Thomas and Edgar Thomas; with amendment (Rept. No. 1551). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Nebraska: Committee on Claims. H. R. 762. A bill for the relief of the legal representatives of Gallus Kerchner, deceased; without amendment (Rept. No. 1552). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CLARK of North Carolina: Committee on Claims. H. R. 782. A bill to extend the benefits of the United States employees' compensation act to R. W. Dickerson; with amendment (Rept. No. 1553). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 921. A bill for the relief of Andrew Kline; with amendment (Rept. No. 1554). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 922. A bill for the relief of William S. Murray; without amendment (Rept. No. 1555). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 923. A bill for the relief of Louis J. Stroud; with amendment (Rept. No. 1556). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 925. A bill for the relief of George Curren; with amendment (Rept. No. 1557). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. BOX: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1109. A bill for the relief of Martin J. Hayes; with amendment (Rept. No. 1558). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2589. A bill for the relief of Josiah J. Hostetler; without amendment (Rept. No. 1559). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6636. A bill for the relief of Philip L. Hamsch; without amendment (Rept. No. 1560). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 8604. A bill to authorize and direct the Comptroller General to settle and allow the claim of Harden F. Taylor for services rendered to the Bureau of Fisheries; without amendment (Rept. No. 1561). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 9395. A bill for the relief of Alton B. Platner; without amendment (Rept. No. 1562). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. IRWIN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 11911. A bill for the relief of Frank J. Spencer; without amendment (Rept. No. 1563). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. ARENTZ: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 557. An act to authorize the disposition of certain public lands in the State of Nevada; without amendment (Rept. No. 1568). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. FULLER: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 1183. An act to authorize the conveyance of certain land in the Hot Springs National Park, Ark., to the P. F. Connelly Paving Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1569). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. McSWAIN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 1508. A bill providing for the advancement of Robert G. Dickson on the retired list of the Army; with amendment (Rept. No. 1570). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mrs. KAHN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 10615. A bill for the relief of Alexander M. Proctor; without amendment (Rept. No. 1571). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WURZBACH: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 11091. A bill for the relief of Harvey H. Padgett; without amendment (Rept. No. 1572). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 12088) for the relief of Sallie E. Hall; Committee on the Civil Service discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (H. R. 12415) for the relief of the John Sealy Hospital, at Galveston, Tex.; Committee on Ways and Means discharged, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (H. R. 12428) granting a pension to Bridget Keegan; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 12521) to amend an act entitled "An act granting the consent of Congress to the city of Knoxville, Tenn., to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Tennessee River at or near Henley Street in Knoxville, Knox County, Tenn.," so as to extend the time within which said bridge may be constructed; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WINGO: A bill (H. R. 12522) granting the consent of Congress to the Texarkana & Fort Smith Railway Co. to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a railroad bridge across Little River in the State of Arkansas at or near Morris Ferry; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CRISP: A bill (H. R. 12523) to provide for the appointment of an additional district judge for the northern district of Georgia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'CONNOR of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 12524) to relinquish all right, title, and interest of the United States in certain lands in the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROWBOTTOM: A bill (H. R. 12525) for the control of the destructive floods of the Wabash River and its tributaries; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. WOOD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 343) to supply a deficiency in the appropriation for miscellaneous items, contingent fund of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BRAND of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 12526) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth C. Benton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CABLE: A bill (H. R. 12527) granting a pension to Alpha Cremean; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 12528) for the relief of Strother B. and Mary N. Earls; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHRISTOPHERSON: A bill (H. R. 12529) providing for the distribution of the estate of Matobdoka, deceased Yankton Sioux Indian; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIS: A bill (H. R. 12530) granting a pension to Mary A. Shull; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GAMBRILL: A bill (H. R. 12531) for the relief of Daniel S. Schaffer Co. (Inc.); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GIBSON: A bill (H. R. 12532) granting an increase of pension to Sadie B. Cowles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUDSPETH: A bill (H. R. 12533) for the relief of E. B. Rose; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mrs. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 12534) for the relief of Warren Burke; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. KEMP: A bill (H. R. 12535) for the relief of Harrison H. Bradford; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENDALL of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 12536) granting a pension to Elizabeth Powell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12537) granting a pension to Agnes E. Kimmel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NELSON of Maine: A bill (H. R. 12538) granting a pension to Maud A. Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STALKER: A bill (H. R. 12539) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Boyce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12540) granting an increase of pension to Esther M. Amey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12541) granting an increase of pension to Edith Peeling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12542) granting an increase of pension to Margaret Sanford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEAGALL: A bill (H. R. 12543) granting a pension to Stephen Swan Ogletree; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TARVER: A bill (H. R. 12544) granting a pension to Pink Foster Sanders; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 12545) granting an increase of pension to Eliza Bunn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia: A bill (H. R. 12546) for the relief of J. W. Talbert; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WHITLEY: A bill (H. R. 12547) granting an increase of pension to Willhelmina Heisner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

7335. By Mr. BLOOM: Petition of citizens of New York, urging the passage of the bill (H. R. 6603) providing for 5½-day week for post-office employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

7336. By Mr. COYLE: Petition of Atlas Council, No. 963, Fraternal Patriotic Americans, Northampton, Northampton County, Pa., urging the enactment of the Robison-Capper free public school bill into law; to the Committee on Education.

7337. By Mr. CRAIL: Petition of George P. Lacey, a veteran of the Spanish War and of the Philippine insurrection, protesting against the passage of the Robinson-Knutson pension bill; to the Committee on Pensions.

7338. By Mr. EVANS of California: Petition of Gertrude B. Harris and 20 other persons, indorsing the passage of the Capper-Robison bill; to the Committee on Education.

7339. By Mr. McKEOWN: Petition of A. J. Hamilton and other citizens of Kellyville and Creek County, Okla., urging immediate action on House bill 2562, providing for increased rates of pension for the veterans of the Spanish War period; to the Committee on Pensions.

7340. By Mr. SWANSON: Petition by Woman's Christian Temperance Unions of Stanton and Massena, Iowa, favoring Federal supervision of motion pictures in interstate and international commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7341. By Mr. YATES: Petition of John W. Boxwell, Sheridan and Beach Road, Waukegan, Ill., urging the immediate passage of House bill 6147; to the Committee on the Library.

7342. Also, petition of Dr. U. S. Grout, professor of geology, Evanston, Ill., commending the passage of Senate bill 2498 and urging the passage of House bill 6981; to the Committee on Agriculture.

7343. Also, petition of Mrs. T. L. Stone, 559 Aldine Avenue, Chicago, Ill., protesting against the Jones-Capper bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

7344. Also, petition of Mrs. James F. Portor, 1085 Sheridan Road, Hubbard Woods, Ill., protesting against the Hawley-Smoot tariff bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, May 22, 1930

The Chaplain, Rev. ZeBarney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most merciful God, fountain of all grace, Thou uncreated source of life, who hast made us living souls, and coming forth in this our fleeting form hast given us to have life within ourselves, grant us at this morning hour the bestowal of Thy wondrous gifts of wisdom, kindness, and patience, that we may find our work a joy and count all labor light that is undertaken out of love toward Thee.

Touch the heart of this great Nation, kindling her undazzled eyes at the full midday beam, and guard us from all tendencies to careless, fitful service on behalf of all mankind. Keep us ever mindful of the solemn obligations our duty doth impose, that we may know the fuller life exceeding its own promise in its ripened store and find our perfect rest in Thee, who wilt not rest till Thou art perfected in us. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings when, on request of Mr. Fess and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Farrell, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3975) to amend sections 726 and 727 of title 18, United States Code, with reference to Federal probation officers, and to add a new section thereto.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House:

H. R. 6807. An act establishing two institutions for the confinement of United States prisoners; and

H. R. 7412. An act to provide for the diversification of employment of Federal prisoners, for their training and schooling in trades and occupations, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 11371. An act to provide living quarters, including heat, fuel, and light, for civilian officers and employees of the Government stationed in foreign countries; and

H. J. Res. 300. Joint resolution to permit the Pennsylvania Gift Fountain Association to erect a fountain in the District of Columbia.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allen	George	McCulloch	Shortridge
Ashurst	Glass	McKellar	Simmons
Barkley	Glenn	McMaster	Smoot
Bingham	Goldsborough	McNary	Steak
Black	Greene	Metcalf	Steiner
Blaine	Hale	Norbeck	Stephens
Borah	Harris	Nye	Sullivan
Bratton	Harrison	Oddie	Swanson
Brock	Hastings	Overman	Thomas, Idaho
Broussard	Hatfield	Patterson	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Hawes	Phipps	Townsend
Caraway	Hayden	Pine	Trammell
Connally	Hebert	Pittman	Tydings
Copeland	Heflin	Ransdell	Vandenberg
Couzens	Howell	Reed	Wagner
Cutting	Johnson	Robinson, Ark.	Walcott
Dale	Jones	Robinson, Ind.	Walsh, Mass.
Deneen	Kean	Robison, Ky.	Walsh, Mont.
Dill	Kendrick	Schall	Waterman
Fess	Keyes	Sheppard	Watson
Frazier	La Follette	Shipstead	Wheeler

Mr. FESS. I wish to announce that the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] is detained on business of the Senate.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to announce that the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are detained from the Senate by illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. McNARY. I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the routine morning business the Senate shall proceed to the consideration of unobjected bills on the calendar under Rule VIII.